AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.—MARCH, 1893.—NO. 3.

THE OLD TESTAMENT SAINTS.

(*Continued.*)

III.

THE root of perfect goodness is in the Old Testament as in the New—Faith. It is by faith, St. Paul tells us, (Heb. xi.) that the patriarchs, the prophets, the religious heroes of old were pleasing to God; and faith here means not merely a speculative belief, but a living sense of God and a boundless reliance on His promises and on His love. To the patriarch under his tent, to the warrior fighting the battles of Jehovah, to the pious Hebrew in the daily walks of life, God was ever present: *Vivit Deus in cujus conspectu sto.* His power and His action were felt in everything. To the devout imagination of the Israelite, the immediate causes of things disappear; the primary cause, God, comes to the front and hides all else. He appears as the sole active power in Nature. It is He who causes the sun to rise and to set, and who guides the stars in their course through the heavens. It is He that shakes the earth to its foundations and moves the ocean to its depths. He watches over and controls the sustenance of all that has life. "Thou sendest forth springs in the vales. . . all the beasts of the field shall drink. . . . The young lions roaring after their prey and seeking their meat from God. . all expect of Thee that Thou give

them food in season." The whole 103d Psalm is a magnificent expression of the same thought. God's action and government are not confined to inanimate or unconscious beings; it embraces all human action and human events. He is the author of all that happens. Prosperity and adversity proceed equally from His will. In the language of the patriarchs, and indeed of Hebrew literature in general, all happiness comes directly from the hand of God, and all suffering is a punishment or a trial ordained by Him. When Job says: "*The Lord hath given and the Lord hath taken away*," he echoes the common thought of the Hebrew people, and when he adds: "*Blessed be the name of the Lord*," he expresses that sense of utter dependence on and submission to the divine will, which forms one of the most prominent features of the Old Law piety, as indeed of the religious mind among the Eastern races down to the present day.

This deep religious feeling gave a peculiar, distinctive tone to the whole Jewish conception of the moral life. Their notions of duty had, of course, much in common with those of other peoples. The fundamental requirements of the domestic and social life, to which the first moral obligations correspond, are about the same everywhere, and the voice of conscience which reveals them is heard in all men. Indeed in many of the duties of public and private life, the moral standard of Greece and Rome stood, to say the least, on as high a level as that of the Hebrews, and many teachings contained in their ethical writings can, without irreverence, be placed side by side with the inspired maxims of the Sapiential books. But the foundation on which they rested was entirely different. Outside the chosen people, duty was determined by tradition, by custom, or by positive human enactment; and when philosophers sought to account for the rules of conduct thus enjoined, they referred them to nature, order, beauty, happiness, or whatever else they deemed to be the ultimate object of life, and there they stopped. For the Israelites, on the contrary, the whole law of conduct came directly from God. He it was who by a supernatural manifestation of His will taught man his duty from the begin-

ning, and by that same will in later times He moulded His people. His will was the source, the measure and the ultimate reason of all duty. "Religion," says Kant, "consists in recognizing all our duties as divine commands," and this was the condition and feeling of the Israelites to an extent unknown to any other people.

In addition to all His other claims on their loyalty, as their Maker and Ruler, He had vouchsafed to enter into a special covenant with them, promising His all-powerful protection in return for their faithfulness. He had given them a law which embraced all the principal aspects of their existence. It was not only a moral and religious, but also a domestic, political and social law. To be thus guided in all things by God Himself was the pride and joy of the true Israelite. To know the law and to practice it was his highest happiness, his exclusive privilege. "O happy are we Israel," exclaims the prophet Baruch (iv, 4), "because the things that are pleasing to God are made known to us." The same tone of grateful exultation runs through the Prophets and the Psalms. *Lauda Jerusalem Dominum..... qui annuntiat verbum suum Jacob et judicia sua Israel. Non fecit taliter omni nationi et judicia sua non manifestavit eis* (Ps. 147). Its culminating expression is found in the 118th Psalm (*Beati immaculati*), where, in an endless variety of forms, the Law is proclaimed to be the perfection of truth, the infallible guide of life, the source of inexhaustible happiness.

Thus understood the Law got a hold on the affections of the chosen people of which history supplies no other example. It is only by that unique devotion to their Law that we can account for the readiness with which they lent themselves to the gradual expansion of the original code, through the traditions of the elders and the commentaries of the legists, until their whole existence was enveloped, as in a network, and submitted to an unyielding and ultimately unendurable rule (Act. xv, 10). But whether in its true or in its exaggerated proportions, it had made the whole life of the pious Jew into an universal tribute to the divine will,

not unlike that of a religious with us, whose whole existence is regulated by a sacred authority and who feels that in carrying out his "Rule" he is accomplishing all day long the will of God.

It was this view of the Law as being in all its particulars a personal command of God that brought home to the Jewish mind the conception of sin. In nothing more than in this did the Israelites differ from the other nations of antiquity. To the latter, it is true, moral evil appeared vaguely as displeasing to the gods. But this view added nothing to their horror for it. The wisest among them ended by seeing in it nothing but a disease which they deemed it the part of a wise man to correct, but not to dwell upon. Hence the small space it occupies in Greek and Roman literature. That of the Hebrews, on the contrary, is full of it to overflowing. All Sacred History is a revelation of sin, a protest against sin. To denounce it in all its prevailing shapes was the principal mission of the Prophets; to bewail it, to beg forgiveness, to rejoice because God has been merciful and pardoned it, is the burden of most of the Psalms. Everywhere it is proclaimed the greatest of evils, the worst of wrongs, a disregard of the claims of God Himself, a revolt against His authority, a contempt of His love.

And with the sense of sin, comes the shame, the abiding sorrow, the ever-flowing tears of repentance, the insatiable craving for atonement, a feeling scarce thought of among pagans, except for the greatest crimes, and so little applicable to ordinary life, that, in the many disquisitions left us by ancient philosophers concerning the proper frame of mind in which man should approach death, repentence for past sin had absolutely no place. Not so the sinning Israelite. If he turns away from evil and looks for forgiveness, it is in the midst of humiliation and voluntary suffering: *in iejunio et fletu et planctu . . in cilicio et cinere.*

Such then was "the just man", the Saint of the Old Law; deeply religious, full of the thought of God, walking in His presence, ever seeking to know and to do His will, serv-

ing Him loyally and lovingly, though with more of reverence and of fear than of love; bearing with him an intense belief in a Providence which embraced all things, and accepting all that happened him as coming from the hand of God Himself; sensible of his natural helplessness and weakness, and ever turning to heaven for protection and strength; merciful in turn and kind to others, especially toward the weak and the helpless; truthful in tongue and pure in heart.

IV.

Yet in the real life of the greatest and best of these holy men of olden times, we light occasionally upon particulars which seem entirely out of keeping with our notions of sanctity. And so undoubtedly they are. But the mistake would be to judge by the perfect rule of the Gospel those to whom it had been made known but inchoately and by imperfect anticipation. It is only by degrees that God manifested His will to mankind. The Prophets continue what was begun in the Law and prepare the way for the Gospel. Even though some of God's highest and purest precepts were taught by Moses, it was only little by little that the full intelligence of them broke on the minds of His children. Hence we may notice a constant progress in the moral tone and life of the chosen people. The desert is an advance on Egypt; the period of the Prophets on that of the Judges; the post exilian period is morally and spiritually, as well as chronologically, the nearest of all to the Gospel.

It is only natural that something of a corresponding progress should be noticeable in the long series of sacred portraits which occupy so considerable a portion of the historical books of the Old Testament. For although in many ways they shine out in bright contrast with their surroundings we may well expect to find in them occasional traces of the imperfections of the period to which they belong. From the best men of any time, Jewish or Christian, we must not look for much more than the best that was known in their day.

Many commentators and theologians, ancient and modern, might have spared themselves much trouble, had they been

guided by this obvious truth. Instead of striving to explain away many facts which cannot be reasonably questioned, or to justify them by ingenious argument, or to hide them under allegorical or prophetic meanings, or to remove the responsibility of them from the actors by assigning them to a divine inspiration, it would have been more simple and nearer the truth to say, that those servants of God whose action is unjustifiable in the light of principle, acted in good faith and in conformity to what was known to them of moral truth. Bearing this in mind it is easy to understand how God, to whom the upright intention is everything, vouchsafed to choose as the instruments of His merciful Providence, and honored with especial protection and favor, men who in times of greater moral enlightenment would have been utterly unworthy of such a privilege.

The writers to whom we refer seem again to lose sight of the explanation given by Our Lord Himself of the neglect in which God allowed His chosen people to live in regard to His own laws. Thus, unity and indissolubility were the two fundamental laws of the marriage tie from the beginning. But gradually they came to be forgotten, and, for centuries before the Mosaic legislation, polygamy and divorce were practiced freely by the descendants of the patriarchs, as they had been by the patriarchs themselves. Neither by the Law or through the prophets did God choose to interfere with this practice of His people, "because," says Our Lord, "of their hardness of heart," that is of their imperfect moral development, to be improved only by an education extending over ages. The principle is of univeral application, and accounts for many things which are perplexing at first sight in the Sacred Narrative.

To confine ourselves to one of the most noticeable instances, the methods of warfare which prevailed all through antiquity were utterly inhuman, but because they were universal, nobody stopped to question their lawfulness, and the Jews like the other nations followed them freely and without scruple. The same spirit of fierce intolerance, so apparent in their early history, breaks out even in the Psalms, mingling strangely with the tenderest accents of devotion to

God, and dwells with them to the end, as we may see in the case of the disciples of Our Lord asking leave to use their newly got power to bring down fire from heaven on the unfriendly Samaritans (Luke, ix, 54). Considering them from another point of view, the doctrine of a future life, which plays so essential a part in all our moral and religious theories, seems to have been, to say the least, very imperfectly realized by the Israelites before the time of the Captivity ; and the expectation of the Messiah, so vivid and so widespread at the time of His coming and doubtless for many years before, scarce shows itself at all in the prevailing notions of previous times.

Should we wonder then if this ever-changing condition of things reflects itself in the life and thoughts even of those who strove to serve God with all their might and all their strength ?

Whilst admiring, therefore, the glorious characters of the Old Testament, we cannot remain blind to what was missing in them. They belonged to an imperfect dispensation, and they shared in its imperfections. They failed to realize in their fulness the highest teachings vouchsafed to them. They knew and spoke of the fatherhood of God, but it took the Gospel to make them feel that they were His children. Their hearts still clung to life and the things of life ; they respected poverty in others, it is true, but they dreaded it for themselves ; it could never have been the object of their choice. Their chastity, as a nation, was in signal contrast with the universal corruption which reigned all around them ; yet they knew not the higher beauty of a purely virginal life. Their charity was sincere, but limited mostly to their own people. Christ it was who expanded the heart of man and made it like His own, capable of embracing all humanity. Humility was not unknown to them, but they never reached its depths. Christ was the first to reveal them in His life and death, and to impart to them a mysterious fascination which has drawn down into them, ever since He came, the highest and noblest souls the world has known. Finally the Old Testament saint had tasted the bitter

sweets of repentance and atonement ; but he never had had before him the spectacle of the extremes of austerity and purity meeting in one divine person, and the most spiritually enlightened had to wait for the passion and death of Christ to understand all there is of beauty and power and love in a life which gathers its whole inspiration from the Cross.

V.

Yet with all their incompleteness and manifold imperfections the Old Testament saints have taught us much, and even after the light of the Gospel, their thoughts, their examples, and their spirit remain as a permanent factor in the formation of the christian character.

To them, first of all, we are indebted for our original conceptions of God. Even now we know Him only as they knew Him, and whatever subsequent notions we may have added to theirs are drawn out on the lines first laid down by them. The God of the Christians as well as the God of philosophy, and of all civilized nations, is purely and simply the God of Israel. There is not one of the attributes of the divinity that does not stand out in bold relief in the utterance of the patriarchs and of the prophets, and better still in the history of their lives ; their words are the fittest found even yet to express all that we can think loftiest of God.

And in revealing to us the true God, they have taught us to trust in Him, to lean on Him, to obey and to love Him. His Providence is revealed to us, it is true, by Our Lord Himself and in terms of exquisite beauty. But neither His touching reference to the birds of the air and the flowers of the field, nor the assurance of a care more tender, more universal and more abiding for man, though they have brought comfort and courage to numberless souls, have impressed the christian mind as vividly as the dealings of God with His servants in the Old Law. It is in His ever-present help, and in His watchful love for Abraham, for Jacob, for David, and for so many other Old Testament characters, that we have learned first and best the unceasing protection and guidance which God vouchsafes to His children. So also

the law of expiation, the mysterious link that binds together sin and pain, and which is at the root of the Redemption itself and of all atonement. It is a thought which runs right through the Old Testament, and is emphasized by God's dealings with His children from the very first. In almost every page of their history, as well as of their poetry, we are perpetually coming across something to remind us that sin and pain were somehow joined together and could not be parted. The road from sin back again to innocence or to holiness, the road from God's anger to His forgiveness, the road from impurity to cleanness always seems to lie through pain. Pain, and pain only, seems to be recognized as having a truly purifying power; and often when God absolutely forgives, He does not on that account remit the necessary pain which the forgiven sin has brought upon it, but the penitent after he is forgiven has still to bear something of his original punishment. So Moses, though forgiven, yet never enters the promised land. So David loses his child, though he had been told that "the Lord had put away his sin."

Finally the Old Testament saints have taught us to pray. Prayer is a natural instinct of the soul for all those who believe in a living God. But in various ways it needs to be trained, and it is from the holy men and women of Israel that we all have learned the lesson. Not only have they taught us to turn to God in the hour of peril and trial, but also to awaken in our hearts the dispositions with which He should be approached. "Lord teach us to pray" was the demand of His disciples to Christ, and in response He taught them the most perfect of all prayers—brief, yet so full of meaning that it expresses all the legitimate aspirations and wishes of man. But the soul needs to pour itself out more freely and more effusively, to give a fuller expression to what it craves for and to what it feels, and nowhere can such expression be found, so noble or so deep as on the lips of the Hebrew saints. In the prayers of the patriarchs, and in their blessings, which are only another form of prayer, there is a simplicity and a sublimity which cannot be surpassed. Abraham reverently and trustfully pleading for Sodom,

Esther for her people threatened with destruction, Judith in the anticipation of her bold and bloody deed, Solomon pouring forth his thanksgiving in the dedication of the Temple raised by his hands, will teach man to the end of time how to approach God. Above all David "the sweet singer of Israel" with all the experience of a chequered life, by turns a shepherd boy, a youthful warrior, a proscribed exile, and a powerful king, passing through every trial and tasting every bitterness, yet held up by the hand of God whom he ever trusted, and though he had not been faultless, even according to the imperfect standard of his own time, yet because he had repented, David, proclaimed in the end a "man after God's own heart", has left us in the hymns which he composed, and in those which his example inspired—in the Psalter—the most complete, the most beautiful expression ever known of sorrow, of joy, of petition, of praise, of every feeling to which a religious soul may give utterance. Hence its place of honor in the liturgy of the Church, its familiarity to all Christian ages; and well may a Catholic prelate extol it in the following beautiful words :[1]

"He only who knows the number of the waves of the ocean and the abundance of tears in the human eye, He who catches the sighs of the heart before they are uttered, and who hears them still when they are hushed into silence, He alone who can tell how many holy emotions, how many heavenly vibrations have been produced and will ever be produced in the souls of men by the reverberation of these marvelous strains, of these predestinated hymns, read, meditated, sung in every hour of the day and night, in every winding of the vale of tears. The Psalter of David is like a mystic harp hung on the walls of the true Sion. Under the breath of the Spirit of God it sends forth its infinite varieties of devotion, which, rolling on from echo to echo, from soul to soul, awakes in each a separate note, mingling in that one prolonged voice of thankfulness and penitence, of prayer and of praise."

The invaluable lessons thus imparted to all by the Old Testament saints are especially adapted to the early years of

1 Mgr. Gerbet : Dogme de la penitence, p. 243

life and the first initiation to religious truth. No thoughtful reader of the Bible can fail to notice that the formative or educational character of the Law proclaimed by St. Paul is equally true of the whole historical portion of the Old Testament. It is milk for babes, as the Gospel is solid food for men. To the period of childhood and early youth, in nations as in individuals, a special form of spiritual nutriment is necessary. Great height of speculation or depth of thought is beyond their reach. Truth to be brought to their level has to be embodied in individual facts and actions, and the Old Testament supplies them better than any other history. To say nothing of the marvelous element so abundant and so welcome to the youthful mind, there is in the ancient heroes of the Bible a simplicity, a freshness, a nearness to nature which make them, like the heroes of Homer, intelligible and enjoyable to every stage, even the earliest, of culture and of life. It is they who give animation and color to our first lessons of religion and their examples are the last to be forgotten. Abraham, Josue, Solomon and the others stand out in bold relief on the memory, to the end, and ever surrounded by the devout impressions which had gathered round them in early youth. In later years and for more reflective minds, they shed a soft and comforting light on that ever-present question: How does God deal in His final judgment with the countless millions who have lived and died strangers to the helps vouchsafed to the chosen people, and who have never as much as heard of the Jewish or Christian dispensation? A solemn wide-reaching problem, never to be completely solved in this world. We know from St. Paul (Rom. ii.) and from natural reason that they are judged, not by a law they knew not, but by the law that speaks within them. But if we would see farther, we have only to turn to the Old Testament and consider what manner of men God admitted to His friendship and how much of what we know to be evil may be covered by honest ignorance and compensated by devotion to God and to all that is known of His will.

J. HOGAN.

MIXED MARRIAGES.

PUBLICATION OF BANNS—PERFORMANCE OF THE RITE IN CHURCH.

WE premise that mixed marriages are strongly to be discountenanced. There exist, no doubt, some localities where, owing to peculiar social conditions, the evils resulting from such marriages are lessened and where, perchance, they are productive of good, leading to the conversion of the non-Catholic party; but such instances form the exception. As a rule these marriages are dangerous and illicit and the Sovereign Pontiffs have at all times warned the faithful against them. The *Instructio* S. Pont. Pii IX, 15 Nov., 1858, and the *Instructio novissima* 25 March, 1868, are equally pronounced on the subject. "Illa instructio explicite tradit Ecclesiam eas semper improbasse ac tanquam illicitas ac perniciosas habuisse, tum ob flagitiosam in Divinis communionem, tum ob impendens catholico conjugi perversionis periculum, tum ob pravam sobolis institutionem." Nor can there be any question of altering the required conditions "de praemittendis necessariis opportunisque cautionibus, ut scilicet catholicus conjux ab acatholico perverti non possit, ut catholicus ipse conjux teneri se sciat ad acatholicum pro viribus ab errore retrahendum, et ut universa utriusque sexus proles in catholica religione omnino educari debeat," for the *Instructio* expressly adds: "quae quidem cautiones remitti seu dispensari nunquam possunt, cum in ipsa *naturali* ac divina lege fundantur." But whilst we are decidedly in favor of observing the ordinances of the Church in the true spirit, we would call attention to two phases of the subject of mixed marriages which admit of discussion. We propose to plead in favor of proclaiming the Banns for such marriages and also to show reason why it is advisable in this country to have them celebrated in the church, at least in cases where the non-Catholic party is a baptized person.

The reason why the Church originally forbade the publication of the Banns and the contracting in church was to show her disapprobation of such marriages and thus to deter the faithful from contracting them; and the reason why the

Church has, from time to time, modified these rules of discipline, is "ad majora damna ac mala vitanda." In discussing the subject we must not lose sight of these two principles.

On the 4th of Nov., 1741, Benedict XIV issued his *Declaratio Benedictina* declaring mixed marriages (inter catholicum et haereticum baptizatum) valid in Holland and Belgium. Before the issuing of this Encyclical mixed marriages were looked upon as null and invalid, and being considered an apostasy from the faith, dispensation was not granted. Several Pontiffs before Benedict XIV had written against mixed marriages and granted no dispensation "nisi hac expressa lege seu conditione adjecta: abjurata prius haeresi." A few exceptions had been made in favor of "supremi principes, nec nisi gravissima urgente causa eaque ad publicum bonum pertinente." (See Encyclical of Benedict XIV, 29th June, 1748.) Afterwards the *Declaratio Benedictina* was extended to other countries; pastors began to marry such parties and it became necessary to formulate rules, regulating the assistance of the parish priest.

PROCLAMATION OF BANNS.

1.—Let us follow the modifications of the ecclesiastical law on this subject. The first Rescript comes from Pius VI, 13 July, 1782: "quod attinet proclamationes respondemus; cum praeordinatae illae sint ad futuram celebrationem matrimonii et ex consequenti positivam eidem cooperationem contineant, quod utique excedit simplicis tolerantiae limites, *non* posse nos, ut hae fiant, *annuere.*" But 13 May, 1783, the same Pope, writing to the same Archbishop of Mechlin, modifies the rule: "quod primum articulum bannorum sive proclamationem tolerari poterit, ut eae fiant non solum extra ecclesiam sed etiam omnimodo extra locum sacrum." In a later *Instructio* of the S. Congr. Concilii, 19 June, 1793, it is simply said: "Caveant ne in publicandis matrimoniis mixtis religionem exprimant contrahentis acatholici." Pius VIII (Brief 25 March, 1830), takes the proclamations for granted when he says that persons contracting such marriages should be admonished regarding the requirements of the Church,

"eo praesertim tempore quo nuptiarum dies instare videatur, dumque consuetis proclamationibus disquiritur utrum alia sint impedimenta." Gregory XVI (Brief 27 May, 1832) warns pastors, in case parties are unwilling to comply with the necessary requirements, "abstinere non solum a matrimonio ipso sua praesentia honestando, sed etiam a praemittendis eidem proclamationibus atque a dimissorialibus litteris concedendis." It was customary in Bavaria to proclaim the Banns and to grant testimonial letters in all cases of mixed marriages. And again in his *Instructio* 12 September, 1834, he says "tolerandum ut a parocho Catholico consuetae proclamationes fiant," with the caution not to mention the religion of the non-Catholic.

The sixth Provincial Council of Baltimore decreed that Banns should be published before marriage, and when Cardinal Fransonius returned the Decrees as approved by official letter dated 3d July, 1847, he writes: "Quapropter, cum cautelae loco et veluti prudentiae remedium haec Bannorum publicatio haberi debeat, *nulla ratio satis firma videtur obesse* quominus proclamationes *etiam quando agitur de matrimoniis mixtis*, fiant." And at the foot of page 244 there is a note as follows: "Ex responso S. Congregationis, quod infra, 253, reperiatur, Banna etiam matrimoniorum mixtorum sunt proclamanda." It is difficult to say why this prescription was never complied with. In the *Instructio* of Pius IX, 1858, and the *Instructio novissima* of 1868, in which the question of the rite of mixed marriages is fully treated, there is no mention made of the publication of Banns, leaving the impression that this matter is sufficiently settled. In a decree of the S. Congr. S. Officii to Bishop Blanchet, 14 July 1874, it is said: "Posse fieri proclamationes in matrimoniis de quibus agitur (agebatur de matrimoniis inter Catholicos et *infideles*) quatenus Apostolica dispensatione contrahantur, suppressa tamen religione contrahentium . . . Quod, modo certo constare posset de statu libero contrahentium magis forsan expediret, saltem in nonnullis casibus et adjunctis, a memoratis proclamationibus dispensare et hoc ob periculum admirationis vel

scandali vitandum: quod tamen arbitrio A. F. remittitur." There is no danger to be apprehended of giving scandal or of exciting astonishment by the publication of Banns whilst Canon Law undoubtedly allows its being done.

2.—The end of the publication of Banns is to detect impediments and especially the *impedimentum ligaminis.* Many non-Catholics believe that civil divorce breaks the *vinculum matrimonii*, and they have no scruple to attempt other nuptials, whilst the previous spouse still lives. Divorces are very common in some parts of the United States; persons move from one State into another, and hence the publication of Banns is on the whole much more necessary in the case of mixed than in Catholic marriages, in order that at least ordinary precaution be taken to find out whether there exist impediments other than those of *mixtae religionis* or *disparitatis cultus.*

3—Catholics look upon the publication of Banns generally as something irksome, and many of them are desirous to obtain dispensation even when they have to pay a fee to the Chancellor's office. In mixed marriages a favor seems at present extended to the contracting parties by not publishing the Banns; and yet it is clearly the purpose of the Church to show them no favor in the case of such marriages, but rather to place obstacles in the way in order to deter Catholics from contracting them.

4.—The S. Congr. S. Officii, 11 May, 1864, wrote to the Bishop of Natchez "posse fieri proclamationes in mixtis nuptiis." Since that date, to the satisfaction of three successive Bishops and of the clergy, the Banns have been published for mixed marriages in that diocese. This publication gives greater guarantee that the required conditions will be observed by the non-Catholic and it places the same law of publication (a law looked upon as a burden rather than a favor) upon Catholics and non-Catholics alike.

RITE PERFORMED IN CHURCH.

1.—Let us again follow the gradual modification of the law in regard to this practice. Pius VI, by Rescript of 13 July, 1782, addressed to the Archbishop of Mechlin prescribes:

"ut parochus non assistat tali matrimonio in loco sacro, nec aliqua veste ritum sacrum praeferente indutus, neque recitabit super contrahentes preces aliquas ecclesiasticas et nullo modo benedicet." In extending the *Declaratio Benedictina* to the Duchy of Cleves, 19 June, 1793, the same Pope reiterates the same injunction. Pius VIII, in his Brief 25 March, 1830, to the Bishops of the Rhenish provinces, says: "caveant parochi a sacris precibus et ab ecclesiastico quovis ritu iisdem matrimoniis admiscendo." Gregory XVI in his *Instructio ad Episcopos Bavariae*, 12 September, 1834, allows pastors to assist at mixed marriages, to proclaim the Banns, to give testimonial letters but "omni secluso ecclesiastico ritu." These three Popes address themselves to the Bishops of Belgium, Bavaria, the Duchy of Cleves, the Rhenish provinces, countries largely Catholic and where Catholic traditions along with the laws of the Church were respected and observed. There is but one Encyclical on this subject addressed to all the Archbishops, Bishops and Ordinaries of Dioceses. This, the only general document, the Encyclical of Pius IX, 15 November, 1858, departs from the previous rule and grants exceptions.

"Quod si in aliquibus locis sacrorum Antistites cognoverint easdem conditiones impleri haud posse, quin graviora exinde oriantur damna ac mala, in hoc casu tantum Sanctitas sua prudenti eorundem sacrorum Antistitum arbitrio committit, ut ipsi judicent quando commemoratae conditiones de contrahendis mixtis hisce nuptiis extra ecclesiam et absque parochi benedictione impleri minime possint et quando in promiscuis conjugiis ineundis tolerari queat mos adhibendi ritum pro matrimoniis contrahendis in Dioecesano Rituali legitime praescriptum, exclusa tamen semper Missae celebratione ac diligentissime perpensis omnibus rerum, locorum ac personarum adjunctis, atque onerata ipsorum Antistitum conscientia super omnium circumstantiarum veritate et gravitate."

What do the particular statutes and decrees of this country prescribe? The Statuta Synodi Baltimorensis Diocesis 1791 (vide Concilia Prov. p. 19) speaking of mixed marriages say: "Hae nuptiae benedicendae non sunt illa benedictione quam permittit Rituale Romanum intra Missam pro sponso et

sponsa." This statute simply forbids the blessing at nuptial Mass. Were mixed marriages at that time contracted in church and according to the rite commonly used for Catholic marriages? It would seem so; who can tell? The Synod of 1810 (vide p. 27) admonishes pastors to introduce the custom "ut omnia matrimonia in Ecclesia celebrentur," and no distinction is made between Catholic and mixed marriages.

The second and third Plenary Councils, whilst expatiating on the evils of mixed marriages and warning the faithful against them, made no decrees regulating the rite of assisting at them, and the second merely points out in the Appendix the *Instructio Pii IX* with the *Instructio novissima.*

Our Councils making no laws, nor giving any suggestions on the subject, we are left with the last two documents of Pius IX as guide in the matter.

2.—The *Instructio novissima*, explaining the concession, says "nonnisi per modum exceptionis indulgetur", and assigns the following as the rule when the exception may be applied: "sub conditione ut omnia rerum locorum ac personarum adjuncta diligentissime perpendantur."

Let us examine these "adjuncta locorum ac personarum." The concession embraces two points: the one the permission of assisting at such marriages in the church, "exclusa tamen semper Missae celebratione,"—the other the benediction of the pastor, i.e. either the blessing of the ring or the blessing of the couple. From what we have seen and heard, some bishops and priests, assisting at such marriages, give their blessing to the newly married couple, when the latter desire it. No one seems to scruple it, no Catholic seems to be scandalized at it; on the contrary, every body witnessing the ceremony feels pleased and considers it a becoming act of religion on so solemn an occasion and a nearing to the Church, which in the person of the bishop or priest gives the blessing to the kneeling pair. And why is this so? On account of the different "adjuncta locorum et personarum" in Europe and in America. In Europe, even in localities where Catholics form a minority, scarcely any family intercourse exists between Catholics and Protestants; consequently

young people of both sexes and of different creed rarely meet each other, and scarcely ever in the family circle;—mixed marriages under such adjuncta become not only rare, but also odious and are strongly opposed by the parents of both parties, Catholics and Protestants. And the Church, which detests mixed marriages, has availed herself of these adjuncta, of this social and family opinion to prevent such marriages by making rules which of their own nature inspire good Catholics with awe (exclusion of all religious rites and of Church). But do these adjuncta of social and family opinion exist in a country like the United States? Decidedly not.

Here, there is a common friendly intercourse between young men and women of different creed, not merely in the social but also in the family circle; few, if any Catholics realize that there is anything detestable in a mixed marriage; as a matter of fact, but few parents oppose it, some even favor it for their children; and do what he may, the pastor, who zealously preaches against the evils of mixed marriages, must confess to his own sorrow that the number does not thereby diminish. To put it in one word—Catholic public opinion is not sufficiently against such marriages; and this is due to our natural social surroundings. Hence the rule of the Church, forbidding the ceremony to take place in *loco sacro*, hardly ever deters any Catholic in this country from contracting such a marriage. Indeed I fear it has too often only the effect of irritating both parties, especially the non-Catholic, who looks upon it as a needlessly odious and inconsistent restriction. The Protestant reasons thus: the Church requires that I leave my spouse free in religion, that my children be baptized and raised Catholics, that I keep my promises, but she denies me the entrance in the church on the very day all this is to be ratified. The writer has known cases where parties were married by a Protestant minister in a Protestant church, because they could not be married by the priest in the Catholic church. Why not then apply the exception which the Church appears to allow? The marriage will be looked upon by the Protestant party as more solemn and binding, the contract more sacred, and the promises will be more

readily executed. It will smooth the way in behalf of the conscientious non-Catholic for entering the church. He will say: my spouse is Catholic, so are my children, I myself have been married in that Church and it is but consistent that I should too join it.

3.—It may be replied to all this that the Church has provided for all cases when she allows exceptions to be made whenever necessity demands it "ad vitanda majora mala," and that in particular cases such exceptions have been made. Very true, but the exceptions have given rise to much comment, unjust, if you wish, but which nevertheless seemed a reasonable comment to the people, because exceptions are odious in this democratic country, where each man's vote has the same value, where each one is supposed to have the same standing in the Church and where princes, counts and nobles are not supposed to enjoy special privileges denied to others in equal cases. Why not then grant the privilege *whenever* it be asked for, without distinction as to rich or poor, great or little, influential or obscure? The Bishop is allowed to grant the privilege—the "adjuncta locorum et personarum" give sufficient reasons to grant it *always*—it will not increase mixed marriages nor will it appear scandalous to the people. On the contrary it is my firm conviction that this concession would prevent much evil, would attach the married couple more strongly to the Church and would impel the non-Catholic more readily to fulfill the promises and to feel more kindly disposed towards the Church. The Church has frequently relaxed the severity of her rules "ad vitanda majora mala" and because they did not deter Catholics from contracting mixed marriages. Here in the United States a severe and strict interpretation of the rules is observed without obtaining the desired effect of diminishing the number of such marriages or of lessening the evils thereof.

Conclusion.—If it be the intention of the Church to continue the publication of Banns, let us not make a favorable exception for mixed marriages. If the Church allows the contracting of such marriages in church, let us not deny this privilege to those who desire it.

YOUNG PREACHERS CAREFUL AND CARELESS.

My best sermon is the one I know the best.—*Massillon.*

Many a wandering discourse one hears in which the preacher aims at nothing and hits it.—*Dr. Whately.*

I have always noticed that the best extemporaneous speeches are those which have been carefully written out beforehand, the manuscript being conveniently within reach in the orator's waistcoat pocket.—*J. R. Lowell.*

HOW long should a young priest continue the practice of writing and memorizing his sermons? The question was recently put to a scholarly Catholic prelate and author, and his unhesitating reply was: "Ten years at least." Had the inquiry been as to the length of time during which the average young priest does continue the practice, it is probable, and regretable, that the true answer might have been widely different. As a matter of justice and propriety, no other form of public discourse is entitled to so elaborate a preparation as the sermon; as a matter of fact, one is often tempted to believe that for no other is the preparation so inadequate.

No extended argument is necessary to convince even the youngest of those who have been elevated to the priestly rank that the ministry which they exercise in preaching the Word of God merits their most profound respect, and calls for the best efforts of their intellects and hearts. It is sufficient to remind them that, after the adorable Sacrifice of the the altar and the administration of the sacraments, no function is so sublime in itself, or so potential in its results, as that for the performance of which their warrant is the commission of Jesus Christ: "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature."[1] That Moses and Jeremiah proclaimed themselves unworthy and incapable of this sacerdotal function; that Isaias, to be equipped for its exercise, needed an angel to purify his lips; that St. John the Baptist prepared himself therefor by the most austere penance and solitude; that St. Teresa declared that she would willingly give her life a thousand times over for the happiness of being charged with so noble a mission—these

1 Mark xvi, 15.

are considerations well calculated to impress us with a due sense of its dignity, while the prime fact that preaching was the chief occupation of our Saviour during the three years of His apostolic life is not only a proof of the intrinsic excellence of the work, but an indication as well of its relative importance among those duties which the priest, "another Christ," has contracted the obligation of performing.

Were any further considerations necessary to imbue the preacher with an exalted idea of his ministry, they would be found in the magnitude of the results—the glory of God and the salvation of souls—which it is the purpose of the spoken word to accomplish, and in the tremendous responsibilities incurred by those who neglect to do what in them lies toward the achievement of those results. It has been well said that, in practical importance, the sermon scarcely yields to the sacraments ; for, although these latter are the divinely ordained channels of God's grace, it commonly happens that preaching is the only means by which those who stand most in need of that grace can be brought to the tribunal of penance and to the Holy Table. There is nothing fanciful or exaggerated in the statement that, as often as the priest announces the Word of God to his people, the interests involved in his discourse, and the results dependent on its force or its feebleness, are incomparably greater than those which confront the advocate appealing to a jury on behalf of a fellow-creature's liberty or life. Theoretically, indeed, it is almost impossible for the preacher to have too lofty a conception of the dignity and importance of his office ; practically, however, it is quite possible that in his hands the dignity may be compromised and the importance disregarded, —quite possible that he may come to merit not only the epithets "traitor" and "wretch" with which Quintilian brands the lawyer who fails to do his best for his client, but the terrible anathema of Holy Writ : *Maledictus qui facit opus Dei negligenter.*[1]

Admitting that the genius essential to the formation of a

1 Jerem. xlviii, 10.

pulpit orator of the highest grade is nature's dower to but very few, and that notable excellence even in lower grades is due in a considerable measure to natural faculties whose lack can be supplied by no amount of industry, there still seems to be no valid reason why the sermons of every man whom God has called to the ministry of His divine word should not be useful, effective, and, in the truest sense of the much abused term, eloquent. Whether the discourses of any given preacher merit this characterization or its opposite, will be found to depend principally on the degree of thoroughness with which he prepares himself for their delivery. And what is meant here is not the remote or general preparation, essential as that undoubtedly is, not the acquisition of an abundant store of knowledge, the leading of an exemplary and a holy life, a habit of study, the spirit of prayer, ardent zeal, purity of intention, and all those other qualities of head and heart that go to form the character of the man "behind the sermon;" but the measures taken and the means employed in the actual composition of a particular discourse. Concerning this proximate preparation of the sermon, it may be taken for granted that according as it is thorough or inadequate during the first few years of the preacher's ministry, so it will commonly continue to be throughout his career. Initial carefulness in this respect sometimes lapses into subsequent negligence; but very rarely will it be found that the contrary is the case, that a negligent young preacher makes a careful old one.

Much, then, depends on the manner in which the young priest prepares his sermons; and the remainder of this paper will be given up to a brief discussion of the several methods of preparation that are open to his choice. It may be well to premise that by a "young priest" is meant one whose ordination dates back not further than a decade; and that what follows is based on the supposition of his having, as in the majority of cases he undoubtedly has, ample time to devote to an adequate preparation.

The least complex, and one of the least commendable, of all methods of making oneself ready for the pulpit is that which

consists wholly and solely in an exercise of the memory, the preparation being restricted to the simple process of getting by heart the discourse of another. Viewed as a manifestation of altruistic sentiment, such a course is perhaps not absolutely indispensable, and it must further be admitted that those who adopt it follow the letter of at least one portion of St. Paul's advice[1]—they assuredly do not preach themselves; but even at the risk of sacrificing altruism to egotism, the young preacher will do well to eschew the practice. Apart from all higher considerations, it would seem that a proper self-respect should be sufficient to deter a clergyman from playing in the pulpit the rather questionable *rôle* of another man's proxy. He becomes at best only a species of improved phonograph; and, do what he will, his utterances, like those of the phonographic cylinder, will be mechanical rather than vivified or vivifying.

If there is one dictum on the subject of public speaking that may be accepted as the expression of an ultimate truth, it is this: The orator, be he of the first-rate or the fifth-rate class, must be in earnest. Earnestness in the public speaker, like charity in the Christian, is a supreme quality, supplying at need the lack of many others, but itself replaceable by none. It is, moreover, a quality that cannot be successfully feigned or counterfeited. The most illiterate, as readily as the most cultured audience, perceive when the speaker's tones ring false; and once the discovery is made, his further speech, while it may please the fancy or tickle the ear, will be radically impotent to stir the heart or persuade the will. Now it is obvious that there is a very great, if not an insuperable difficulty in the way of preaching the sermon of an another with the genuine earnestness that naturally accompanies the delivery of one's own; and hence the clergyman who adopts this first method of preparation can scarcely hope to speak effectively.

It is conceivable, of course, that from sterility of invention, barrenness of imagination, defective mental training, or other similar causes, a preacher may be really incapable of

[1] II Cor. iv. 5.

composing a fit discourse; and in so extreme a case, St. Augustine and other writers on the subject say that he may avail himself of the sermons of another; but it is quite safe to assert that, of every twenty who do so avail themselves, nineteen are lacking, not in talent, but in industry. In composition, as in every other art, facility comes with practice, and inability to write is due far more frequently to the non-exertion of mental powers than to their non-existence. That the young priest finds the composition of an original sermon a hard, tedious and irksome task may possibly be his fault, or perhaps only his misfortune; but in either case the difficulty of the work certainly does not exempt him from its performance, especially as this difficulty will surely be found to decrease with each successive trial. Aversion to intellectual labor and sustained mental effort is quite intelligible to most men, but that it forms a valid reason for neglecting plain duties will hardly be urged by any.

If we suppose the preacher to be actuated, in using the discourses of another, by a motive still more ignoble than laziness, if we conceive that he is the slave of vanity and follows this course simply to acquire the fraudulent reputation of being a great preacher, we place him at once beyond the pale of every worthy man's sympathy or respect. Of all the ridiculous mortals that "play such fantastic tricks before high heaven as make the angels weep," none, we take it, is so thoroughly and contemptibly ludicrous as the clerical jack-daw, strutting about the altar or the pulpit in the borrowed plumage of another man's eloquence. The discourses of such a preacher cannot well be other than nugatory in themselves and ultimately disastrous to the speaker; for, while on the one hand it can scarcely be expected that the blessing of God will sanctify the ministry of a plagiarist from vanity, on the other it is more than reasonably certain that sooner or later his plagiarism will be detected and his claims to genuine eloquence discredited. "What a grand sermon Father Blank preached to-day!" said an emotional lady to a companion, a few years ago, as they were leaving a city church after High Mass. "Yes," was the somewhat critical

and quite unemotional reply; "yes, I have always liked that sermon and I read it frequently; but I confess I prefer that *other* one of Father Baker's, on 'The Lessons of Autumn.'"

Viewed from the standpoint of effectiveness in the preacher, or of utility to the congregation, a fifth-rate original sermon is worth at least five times as much as a first-rate borrowed one.

The second method of preparation is substantially the same as the first, and is open to the same general objections. In this second method the process is still plagiarism, but it is the patchwork system of plagiarizing, the preacher borrowing from several sources instead of one. This plan commonly entails more labor than does that of appropriating a complete discourse, and is so far, perhaps, less reprehensible; but it is questionable whether the results achieved are at all preferable. It is certain, in fact, that many of the so-called sermons that are the outcome of this method, far from being coherent discourses in which there appear a natural connection of parts and a logical sequence of thought, are mere literary crazy quilts, wherein all order and unity are conspicuously wanting. In endeavoring to adjust properly to each other passages that were never intended to be so adjusted, the writer almost unavoidably encounters the difficulty that beset a certain preacher who once consulted Father Potter of All Hallows. "I have taken great pains," said he, "to write out twelve or thirteen pages from the various French sermon books, and now, after all my trouble, *I can't make them fit.*"

While neither of the foregoing methods of preparing oneself to preach can be recommended as calculated to produce sermons instinct with the life and vigor that impress men's minds and move their hearts; still in each there is positive preparation, and, at worst, the young preacher who adopts either will be likely to say something, to announce correct doctrine, and to speak in a style not unbecoming God's Word.

There is a third method, negative rather than positive, from which it is too much to expect even these meagre results. This is the summary process that precedes extempore preaching, whether that process be the reading up of a

subject for an hour or two previous to speaking upon it, or the meditation of the proposed discourse during a like period of time, with the possible determining of the main ideas to be developed. As for strictly extempore speaking, speaking absolutely on the spur of the moment, it is so difficult to imagine that any young priest can have the hardihood to tempt Providence by its practice, that it need not be here considered.

As a justification or an excuse for the cursory preparation given to the *quasi*-extemporaneous sermon, it is sometimes contended that this plan approaches more nearly than any other to the apostolic method. The answer, if answer be needed, suggests itself: the method may be an excellent one—for apostles, or for those favored with apostolic gifts and surrounded by apostolic conditions; but it is probably not the best method for even the most experienced ordinary preacher, and it is certainly the worst for the young one. Only long years of careful practice in speaking and writing can form such habits of orderly thought and clear, forcible expression as will enable a preacher to improvise a sermon bearing any claim to the title of good. As a rule, such improvisations show an utter want of order, unity, force and clearness; and not rarely they lack most of all the quality which most of all should characterize them, brevity. It can scarcely be doubted that to this radical evil of preaching without sufficient premeditation, are to be attributed fully nine-tenths of those interminable monologues, without pith or point, which a suffering laity have learned to deplore as "long" sermons—rambling discourses in which, straying from their particular themes, the speakers range in haphazard fashion over the whole field of morals; fall into continual digressions; recover themselves by innumerable repetitions; and, aiming at nothing, take an unconscionable time in hitting it. Who has not listened for an hour to a preacher who with adequate preparation could have said his say and said it far more effectively too, in twenty minutes? Lacking this preparation he delivered a "bald, disjointed chat" in which indeed may have appeared the crude, undigested materials of a discourse, but which no more merited the name

of a real sermon than a confused heap of bricks and mortar, boards and shingles deserves to be called a house.

Perhaps no greater service could be rendered to the long-winded extempore preacher than to present him on Monday with a *verbatim* published report of his discourse of the previous day. Could he be prevailed upon to read the faithful transcript of his "eloquent sermon," to peruse at leisure just what windy nothings and prosy platitudes he said, and remark just how wretchedly he said them, it is tolerably certain that his next effort would be briefer, pithier, and in every way worthier of his office. The rebuke which a Scotch preacher once received from a half-witted member of his flock is oftener merited than administered. The parson's soporific truisms, long drawn out, had gradually produced their legitimate effect of lulling the congregation one by one into placid slumber. Rousing the delinquents by a smart blow on the desk before him, the indignant preacher reprimanded them severely for their gracelessness and inattention, adding that the only one of his hearers who had not been asleep was "the poor fool, Sandy."—"Yes"; interjected Sandy, "and if I were not a fool, I'd have been asleep, too."

A young priest cannot well make a graver mistake in the matter of preaching than to adopt this off-hand style of announcing God's Word. He owes it to the sanctity of that Word, to himself, and to his auditors, be they ever so unlettered, to make each of his sermons as good as is compatible with the measure of talent with which God has dowered him. He is bound in honor and justice to become, in the degree that is possible to him, one

> "whose weighty sense
> Flows in fit words and heavenly eloquence;"

and no course will so surely prevent his attainment of that ideal as preaching without due reflection and previous study.

The fourth method of preparation, and the only one thus far considered that merits approval, is that followed by probably the great majority of conscientious preachers. Briefly it consists in thinking out the whole sermon, but in writing merely its substance. What it supposes and involves may,

perhaps, be best understood from Fénélon's description of the pulpit orator whom he commends for preaching without having written his discourse. He speaks "of a man who is well instructed and has great facility of expression; a man who has meditated deeply, in all their bearings, the principles of the subject which he is to treat; who has conceived that subject in his intellect and arranged his arguments in the clearest manner; who has prepared a certain number of striking figures and touching sentiments, which may render it sensible and bring it home to his hearers; who knows perfectly well all that he is to say and the precise place in which to say it, so that nothing remains, at the moment of delivery, but to find words with which to express himself." There can be no question as to the thoroughness of such a preparation as this; and for the experienced preacher who has had years of practice in his ministry, it is, every thing considered, probably the best of all plans. For the young preacher, however, who has not yet had this practice, there is a still better method, that indicated in the initial paragraph of this paper.

Whether the arguments urged in general against the delivery from memory of written sermons be solid or flimsy (and flimsy some of them assuredly are), few will deny that this writing and memorizing is by far the best plan of action that the young priest can adopt. Even St. Liguori, who inveighs so strongly against preachers that are slaves of their memory, took good care to allow none of his younger Fathers to ascend the pulpit without their having previously written all that they were to say. The inconveniences to which this method is liable may be real, but, at least in the case of the youthful preacher, they are more than compensated for by the sterling advantages which it undoubtedly possesses. And the more gradual is the transition from this full and complete preparation to the less elaborate method mentioned in the preceding paragraph, the greater is the likelihood of the priest's eventually becoming a ready, forcible and effective minister of the divine Word.

A good formula for the actual composition of the sermon

is : some reading, more thinking, careful writing, and no "cribbing." Once the subject has been chosen, and the particular point of view from which it is to be treated determined, it will generally be found beneficial to read what has been written on the same theme by one or several good authors, and to study with the aid of a concordance those portions of Sacred Scripture which bear a special reference to the matter in hand. Having thus acquired an abundance of ideas relative to the subject, our young priest will do well to put aside his books and meditate these ideas, turning them over in his mind, observing how they adjust themselves to his preconceived notions, dwelling on the cognate sentiments which they suggest—in a word, digesting what he has read until it assimilates with his previous knowledge and becomes his own. Whether it be carried on currently with the writing or before that is begun, meditation is the most important and should be the lengthiest process in the building up of a discourse. It is superfluous to add that the more care the writer gives to the expression of his thought, the better will be his sermon. Knowing the mental *status* of the congregation whom he is to address, and the general culture, or want of it, that characterizes them, he will, of course, adapt his language, figures, allusions and illustrations to their particular capacities ; but no degree of illiterateness in a prospective audience justifies negligence, either in the form of the discourse as a whole, or in the structure of its component parts. There is no more pernicious mistake than to suppose that a plain, simple, "common sense" instruction is removed from the sphere of rhetoric, or is not amenable to the laws of thought and expression. Apart from Scriptural texts, quotations should not be multiplied, and those employed should be credited to their proper sources. Stripped of all euphemistic phraseology, plagiarism is theft. No man, perhaps, can be original in what he says ; but every man can and should be original in his way of saying it. Let the skeleton of his thought come from where it may, the flesh and blood that clothe it should be a part of himself.

On the degree of originality, thus understood, that a ser-

mon possesses, depends in a great measure the facility or difficulty of committing it to memory. The more of one's own and the fewer of other men's sentences it contains, the more readily will it be committed. And here it is to be remarked that the stereotyped criticism, "the preacher who delivers his sermon from memory has the appearance of a schoolboy reciting his task," if applicable at all, applies to those only who follow the first or second method of preparation which we have discussed, those who preach the sermons of others. Between the man who delivers his own sentiments and the schoolboy who recites the words of his text-book, there is no parallel, deadly or otherwise. The difficulty of learning a sermon after one has composed it has been a good deal exaggerated. Not a few preachers experience no difficulty whatever; they know their sermon as soon as they have completed its revision. These, perhaps, are exceptional cases; but, given a discourse of ordinary length, representing the outcome of a man's own earnest thought and studied composition, and a very few hours will suffice to memorize it so thoroughly that its delivery may be characterized by all the grace, ease and apparent spontaneity that mark the best extemporaneous speaking, so thoroughly, indeed, that the preacher may interpolate any striking thought that occurs to him on the spur of the moment, and then resume the thread of the original discourse without trouble or hesitation.

In any case, however great the difficulty experienced, either in writing or memorizing his sermon, the young priest will be amply rewarded therefor by the consciousness that, in ascending the pulpit to acquit himself of one of the most august of sacerdotal functions, he is free from the irreverence that cannot but attach to careless preparation, and is doing his best to promote the glory of God and secure the salvation of souls. True, after all is said and done, it is God alone who fructifies the sermon; but it is to be remembered that, if God gives the increase, the planting and watering is the work of the preacher. *Fac tua, Deus sua faciet.*

A. B. O'NEILL, C.S.C.

WITH FATHER KNEIPP.

WŒRISHOFEN is not on the map. Omniscient Bradshaw knows nothing of it. Ubiquitous Cook can book you for Ultima Thule, but he has no tickets for Wœrishofen. There is no help for it; you must go to Munich or one of the other large Bavarian cities and search for the out-of-the-way village that has otherwise become so famed through its great Apostle of the Water Cure—Father Kneipp. At Munich you learn that three convenient daily trains run thence, connecting at Buchloe for Türckheim where diligence or buckboard can be found to carry you in an hour across the plain to Wœrishofen. The early afternoon train will bring you to your destination before night, and it you select. The friendly, though monosyllabic driver to whom you intrust yourself and luggage at Türckheim will tell you, if you ply him with questions, that yonder blue, massive, snow-capped range of mountains skirting the southern horizon are the Bavarian Alps, that, though they seem not far distant, they are a day's hard drive from Wœrishofen, that the permanent residency of the village figures about 1200, that there are still, though the fall is well advanced, at least 800 guests following the "water cure," that the few (which you soon find to be indifferent) hotels are filled, and that you must seek lodging at one of the villager's, and take your meals at a restaurant. If you are a cleric you can live at the "Kurhaus," an establishment, erected by Father Kneipp for the exclusive accommodation of the clergy coming to him for treatment. Having with us a lay companion we seek and find a room in a peasant's cottage, a room which besides its situation, convenient to the church and the "Kurhaus", where the venerable *Doctor animae* turns *curator corporis*, has this to commend itself to our choice that its furnishing puts and keeps vividly before our minds our early college life. A deal table with a tallow dip, a few wooden chairs, a wash stand, a bed, with a strip of carpet alongside, some prints on the walls—these make the contents of our chamber. No luxury surely. Still we have not journeyed to Wœrishofen

to indulge, but solely to harden ourselves (corporally of course) and so we find contentment in the modicum of comforts.

It is dark, and the lamps are lighted by the time we find ourselves in the *Speisezimmer*—the dining hall of the *Kurhotel*—for supper. A good-natured portly German sits by our left at table. Though from Hanover, he lives and carries on business in some distant Russian city. He suffers from malcirculation of the blood in the brain, has been two weeks under the Water Cure and feels improved. Though a Protestant he speaks in the warmest language of the good pastor who has done and is doing such marvels for suffering humanity not only at Wœrishofen, but beyond and beyond. He knows all about the steps one must take to gain access to Father Kneipp, and schools us accordingly. Early next morning we repair to the office of the Kneipp Society, an association for furthering their Rev. Pastor's efforts in his merciful work. There our name, occupation, age, etc. are duly registered and a small blank book given us entitling us to admission to the *Sprechstunde*—the place and hour of consultation with Father Kneipp. It is well, as we afterwards find out, to have previously visited one of the physicians who live in the village for the purpose of studying the Water Cure. They assist in turn Father Kneipp in his office hours and help one, if previsited, in explaining to him the nature of one's ailments. Afterwards we go to the Kurhaus. Father Kneipp is already in the room which serves as an office for consultation—a room furnished on the style of our bed chamber save that the table is longer; there are a few more wooden chairs, and no bed. The expectant throng of the sick and suffering crowd the corridors without, each anxiously waiting his turn for admission. A motley gathering it is—men, women, children, rich, poor, lay, cleric, jostle each other. They come from many lands, speak many tongues, represent all sorts of bodily infirmity. The man at our elbow speaks English. He arrived a few days ago from Cape Town, South Africa. He suffers from some nervous disorder brought on by excessive business strain. The doctors gave him up as incurable. He read Father Kneipp's,

"My Water Cure," and undertook the long, tedious journey from the Cape, with the hope of regaining health under the direction of its author. There is that in the face of the man which assures the fulfillment of his determination to spend a year in Wœrishofen under the "Wasser-Kur."

The lady in yonder invalid chair is from Ireland. For seventeen years she has been the victim of excruciating gout. She has been here one year and feels inclined to return home and bear her cross unto the end, but Father Kneipp assures her that she is on the way to recovery, advises her to remain a while longer and promises her restoration to health.

The young man nearby is a Hungarian, a lawyer from Buda Pesth. He speaks German and on inquiry we learn that he has a painful swelling on his knees, has spent most of his possessions in medical advice and medicine. He has been here two weeks and has improved greatly. He will soon go home, there to continue the Water Cure on the lines prescribed by Father Kneipp.

The knot of priests near the door are from various parts of France, the one walking down the corridor from Belgium. There are several here from Pennsylvania, from Kansas, and California.

There is no mistaking that face. It is that of a Jew from Jerusalem. Those dark features belong to a man from somewhere beyond the Caucasus. That shabbily clad woman shrinking away from the central crowd, comes I know not whence. Afterwards, when in the office, she lifts the bandage now concealing her face, we are horrified to see how the dread Lupus has eaten away her features. Even Father Kneipp, accustomed though he is to treat every variety of human misery, could not repress the exclamation "Schrecklich!" when he looked first at that face. He is gaining the mastery over the frightful disease by his simple applications.

Speaking of this case reminds us of two other equally desperate ones with which the same potent hands are successfully grappling; the one that of a boy from New England who was obliged to make much of his journey to

Wœrishofen afoot, the railway officials not allowing him to travel on the cars because of his loathsome disease; the other that of a young man who now vends a small collection of wares near the Kurhaus.

The crowd at length thins down and it is our turn to enter. Father Kneipp sits at the middle of the long table, on either side of him some clerics, nearby the physician of the day. To the latter we hand our little blank book and placing ourselves before the central figure hastily explain our ailments. An eye is fixed on us which seems to read us through and through, whilst it takes in at the same time our dress and general outer appearance. There is a twinkle in that eye and a winning smile on the lips of the good *Pfarrer*, as in his old fashioned Suabian he remarks on the over-tightness of our Roman collar, and suggests widening it with his scissors, so as to give our breathing apparatus fuller play.

There is no time to explain how a traveling priest is limited in the choice and girth of his neck-gear, for the lips that have uttered the pleasantry at once outline the treatment we are to undergo during the next fortnight. The physician writes down what the *Pfarrer* prescribes. We take our booklet, bow ourselves out, elbow through the remaining crowd, and hastily scan our sentence. It reads thus

H.	O.	Wg.	4	Tg.
S.	O.	"	4	"
Kn.	V.	"	3	"
S.	O.	"	2	"

With the aid of a reference table in our blank book we decipher the symbols to mean that during the first four days each morning we are to have a half-bath, each afternoon an upper-douche and must wade in the running brook; during the next four days to be treated to a forenoon under and an afternoon upper-douche, and to continue our daily perambulation of the brook; the three following days to be characterized by knee and full-douches; the two last days to repeat the treatment prescribed for the preceding second series of four days.

We go at once to the nearest bathing establishment to

have ourselves passed through the first stage of our ordeal. We shall not attempt to describe the sensation experienced by the douches à la Kneipp. Our words would count for little. The douches vary considerably, but they are all degrees, culminating in the "Blitz" douche. The name is suggestive. We have never felt a douche of genuine lightning, but we fancy the sensation must be not totally unlike that which follows being struck by a well directed stream of cold water verging toward the freezing point. The provident care of Father Kneipp, which pervades all the bathing establishments of the place, sees to it that these jets of cold water shall not be of long duration. As a rule they last but a few minutes, and are tempered to the needs and strength of the individual.

The application of the cold element over, a genial warmth pervades the organism. Without drying any portion of the body save those which are habitually exposed to the air, we hurry into our garments and out to the roads or fields for a brisk walk or run in order "to make the reaction" as they say.

The morning and afternoon douches are the pivots of the day's life at Wœrishofen. They are also the climax of the general lines of treatment there pursued, for you are supposed to follow out the other leading feature of the "Kneipp Cure." "Early to bed and early to rise" is an inviolable rule for every "Kurgast." As soon as possible after your morning toilet you hasten away to the nearest meadow and there walk or run for half an hour, barefooted, in the wet grass. Failing the grass, flag-stones, well watered, make a good substitute. In such case, however, you shorten somewhat the time of your tramp. It is Father Kneipp's delight to see the new-falling snow, as it offers his guests a cooler medium of movement, just as we have heard him say he prefers the winter season for his cures, as the water is then colder and proportionately effective. In the afternoon after the second "Sprechstunde" Father Kneipp repairs to the "Mariengang" a long shedlike structure under which he lectures for about an hour. An interesting and curious

feature of the day is this lecture, interesting and in many ways instructive as to its matter, for it covers always some important point connected with human health. Father Kneipp possesses a wide practical knowledge of the common plants of the garden, and we do not remember to have heard anything more attractive than his exposition of their medical properties and the manner of using them in various ailments. Curious it is, too, at this lecture, to see the scores of barefooted or sandalled and unsocked auditors standing on the damp ground, often under the dripping roof, or even in the rain, listening to the sage counsel of the venerable priest-physician. One learns at Wœrishofen to unlearn some long-cherished notions regarding the care of the body. You find that your system when brought under the toughening process followed there, will bear up and thrive, that health of body and mind will be more enduring and vigorous, when the effeminating influences of luxury are shunned, and you are brought to live under Spartan regime. But of the *rationale* of the Water Cure more hereafter.

After the lecture a goodly number may be seen wending their way toward the south, where a rapid mill-stream enters the village. Here about twenty yards of the brook's length are made to flow over a partly-pebbled, partly-planked bottom, and here it is that the last act of the day's performance takes place—the *Wasser gehen*—water treading. A sense of the ludicrous is apt to be stimulated at seeing a multitude of men of ripened years, apparently turned youngsters, and paddling knee-deep in the mill-stream. The gathering at this spot is almost as motley as that of which we formed a part at the office of consultation. We soon become acquainted with our fellow-tramps, they represent most of the civilized portions of the globe, every stratum of society, every walk of life. For the nonce all social barriers are washed away by the running brook. There are Cardinal A. and Bishop B., a missionary from the East, a parish priest from the West, a seminarian from Paris, another from Rome. There are Barron R. and Count N., a druggist from Chicago, a merchant from Kansas City.

At Wœrishofen one is expected to walk also on the other lines of the Kneipp Cure. Wine, beer, all alcoholic drinks, tea and coffee, as a rule, are forbidden; though it must be admitted that many who drench themselves heroically with countless cold douches, give way lamentably before the restrictions made on their palate. Father Kneipp, however, has a telling sanction for his regulations. If he once requires a person to abstain from any of the articles of diet proscribed, and such person disobey, he simply requests the patient to go elsewhere for advice and treatment. The good pastor, however, is reasonably indulgent to human weakness. He has invented a coffee made chiefly of roasted malt, which makes an excellent substitute for the aromatic drink, whilst it does not wear upon the nerves as does coffee.

Father Kneipp pays marked attention to the dress of his patients. He insists on all garments being of loose fit, and advises the disuse of shoes and stockings when the weather at all permits. Accordingly Wœrishofen guests are mostly a bare or sandal-shod race.

He is pronouncedly adverse to all woolen clothing worn next to the body. Instead of flannel he advises coarse or loosely woven linen.

There are, to be sure, many people who pooh-pooh the cold water treatment, with its attendant hardening processes. Let them, however, go to this Bavarian village, or to another of the many similar resorts scattered throughout Europe, and see the regime in its actual application, and they will realize that there are other things on earth than are dreamt of in their philosophy.

There is an advantage in the general comfortless character of Wœrishofen's lodgings. Its guests are almost forced to live outside doors, and this fact has doubtless no small influence in effecting many of the wonderful cures which take place there.

During the odd hours of the day we learn more about the village, its environments, and history. We read, moreover, the Kneipp literature—the books which he himself has written or which have grown around his system, and thus

as well as by frequent contact with himself we come to know more about the character and life of this truly great man—great in his knowledge of human afflictions and their remedies, but greatest in his heroic self-sacrifice for the bettering of his suffering fellows.

II.

If there be such things as self-made men, the pastor of Wœrishofen merits a first place amongst that class of heroes, and that not only from an intellectual and social, but especially from a physical point of view. He loves to refer in his books and lectures to his humble peasant origin, and to his early struggles with poverty and reverses, so that most people who know him at all know the story of his life. How he passed his boyhood and young manhood assisting, from the time he was able, at his father's loom, or laboring afield, yet all the while cherishing in his heart the longing to become a priest; how in his twenty-second year he left the parental roof to seek a benefactor who would aid him to reach the goal of his hopes; how he found a helper in the person of the prelate Dr. Matthias Merkle, whose instruction enabled him to make the third class in the Dillingen gymnasium; what rapid strides he made in this institution, and how under the severe mental strain, his health gave way, and the theretofore robust youth became a physical wreck, obliged to abandon his studies; how at this time Theodore Hahn's booklet on hydropathy fell into his hands and he began trying the cold water baths, at first without effect, but afterwards, by modifying the application, with the result that he was able to resume his studies in the seminaries of Dilligen and subsequently Munich, where at the age of thirty-one he was ordained priest, Aug. 6th, 1852; how during the years of his seminary life and thereafter as a priest in his first missions at Biberach, Boos, and Augsburg, and later on, during his chaplaincy in the Dominican Convent at Wœrishofen from 1855 to 1880, and finally during the years of his present pastorate from 1880 until to-day, he made a thorough study of everything connected with hydropathy

and built up a complete hygienic system ; how he regained not only his own health but has been and is instrumental in renewing the health of untold numbers of suffering mortals—all these are facts widely known. But one must have seen the man himself, have seen him especially at work amongst the thousands who flock to him from every part of the civilized globe for advice, to realize not only what his methods have done in his own case, by converting the frail, broken-down student into a tower of strength, capable of supporting unparalleled work, but especially what they have done for others.

What, it may be asked, is the secret of Father Kneipp's success? Probably first of all it is his marvelous insight into the conditions of the human organism. One of the doctors now studying his system in Wœrishofen remarked to the present writer : "We (meaning himself and cofreres) are physicians through study. Father Kneipp is a physician by the grace of God." To this natural gift of intuition into human maladies is largely due the fact that Father Kneipp frequently succeeds in curing where the most renowned physicians, distinguished professors in the leading medical schools of the world, admittedly fail. Indeed we may say that the majority of people go to him for advice after they have been unable to regain health elsewhere and that it is precisely in otherwise hopeless cases that he is most successful.

Then, moreover, his method—the natural one—is eminently reasonable, and *a priori* likely to bring good results. As a rule he attacks no disease directly. He looks on the human system as one whole. When any part is out of order the entirety is deranged. He works on the whole for the good of the part affected. Cold water, diet, clothing, rest, etc., are his means for building up, for strengthening the organism, so that nature shall of itself shake off or resist morbid conditions.

There is nothing probably that impresses the sojourner in Wœrishofen, so much as the indefatigable, unselfish labor of its noble pastor. Notwithstanding the many hours which he devotes each day to giving advice and assistance to the

multitudes who throng to him, crowds which press upon him, bringing back the Gospel scene in Galilee, when the Saviour found not time to take bread : notwithstanding, too, that he has always on hand some literary work for giving his knowledge and experience a wider application to suffering humanity, he nevertheless neglects not his pastoral duties. He is in the strictest sense a pastor to the souls of his flock, as he is a physician to their bodies. It is a sight edifying to Catholic as well as non-Catholic (of the latter there are many visiting the village), to see the venerable priest who is already past the age of seventy years, bearing the Blessed Sacrament in solemn procession to the sick, or heading the funeral train that carries the remains of one of his charge to their last resting place in the quiet little churchyard.

We have said *unselfish labors* for Father Kneipp asks but a trifle for his services. We have watched him as patient after patient inquired the price of their treatment. To those whose appearance indicated poverty he invariably replied : "Das kostet nichts"—to those who seemed quite able to pay, he said : "Das kostet zwei (oder drei) Mark"—two (or three) quarters. Sometimes when he meets very wealthy patients he is known to ask five marks, especially when their dress is extravagant (a profusion, for instance, of decoration on a lady's bonnet) but then he makes known in the plainest terms the grounds of this extra demand. Every one moreover in Wœrishofen knows the use to which the *Pfarrer* puts what money he receives. On the hill overlooking the western side of the village a large building is nearing completion. It will be an asylum accommodating two hundred poor and sick children, whom the good pastor will treat and provide for. Many needy persons come to Wœrishofen, and receive not only advice from Father Kneipp, but the means to live there during treatment and to return afterwards to their homes. All who are acquainted with the man know that he is but a channel for whatever emolument may come to him. It rests not with him but flows directly onward to

some purpose beneficent for his fellow-men. Like the pastor of sweet Auburn :

> Remote from towns he runs his godly race,
> Nor e'er has chang'd nor wish'd to change his place,
> Unpractised he to fawn, or seek for power
> By doctrines fashion'd to the varying hour.
> Far other aims his heart has learned to prize
> More skill'd to raise the wretched than to rise.

F. P. SIEGFRIED.

HISTORY OF THE BIRETTUM.

THERE can hardly be any doubt that the origin of the Birettum in the Church is to be traced back to the use of the *birrus* among the Romans, a garment which ordinarily covered the shoulders, but could be easily drawn over the head as a protection against the inclemency of the weather or otherwise. The English use of the words *cap*, *cape* and *cope*, all of which are at times used to signify either a head-covering or a cloak, throws some light on the manner in which the head-dress came in time to be associated with, or perhaps substituted for, the shoulder garment.[1] The *birrus* was, from the earliest Christian times, regarded as a mark of sacred dignity. In this sense St. Gregory refers to the "*birrus albus* quo induebantur recens baptizati," and in the life of St. Odo (Acta S. Benedicti Saec. v, p. 167) we read that on a certain occasion he wore a *birrus* like a cap, the two suspended ends of which the children reverently approached to kiss.[2] This suggests the "cowl," which combines both cape and hood.

1 Birettum a *birrus* deducenda vox videtur ; nam ut *birrus* vestem qua corpus tegitur, ita Birrettum eam vestis partem quae caput tegit significat ; est enim diminutivum a *birrus*. (Glossar. du Cange vox *Birettum*.)

2 "Et *birrum quo tegebatur more cappae*, per extremitatem apprehendentes osculabantur." Du Cange Glossar. *Birrus*.

Baronius in his Annals describes, as part of the ancient dress distinguishing a Bishop, the *birrus*, which covered the shoulders, and of which the cape, in the shape of a cowl at the back, worn at present by prelates, is probably a remnant.

From what has been said we can readily trace the use of the Birettum as an outcome of the *birrus*. The cap was always regarded as a mark of honor. Among the ancients a freed-man received a cap as a token of his liberty, and there is no reason to suppose that the early Catechumens looked upon their elevation to the rank of Christians in any other light than that of acquired liberty from the bonds of paganism and sin.

In its original form as a separate garment it appears to have been a close-fitting cap made of linen, or any other soft material, which could be worn under the helmet or ornamental cap.[1]

As a distinctly ecclesiastical head-dress, no mention is made of the Birettum earlier than the tenth century. In the records of the degradation of the episcopal incumbent of Cahors, in the year 956, it is stated that he was deprived, among other insignia, of the Birettum.

But in the following centuries we find it constantly used as a mark of religious, civil, and military distinction. For a time, during the eleventh and early part of the twelfth centuries, the Birettum seems to have been the distinctive feature of the dress of the Supreme Pontiffs. The bronze gate of the Lateran Baptistery shows Pope Celestin III with the Birettum. Afterward it became a mark of ecclesiastical investiture. Boniface VIII bestows an ecclesiastical benefice, and transmits as its warrant the Birettum.[2]

After this time we constantly meet with the use of Birettum as a token of pontifical munificence toward ecclesiastics

1 Capitis tegmen, lineum, tenue, strictum, forma ipsius capitis. Erat vero *Birretum* interius capitis tegmen, ita subter capitium *cappae* dispositum ut non nihil super humeros deflueret. *Statut. Eccles. Aquens. Mss. ann., 1260.*

2 Bulla Bonifacii VIII P. P. "Illudque (Beneficium ecclesiast.) eidem Thomae contulimus nec non de ipso per nostrum Birretum praesentialiter investimus," eadem verba habentur in Diplomate Roberti Cantuariens. archiepiscop. apud Will. Thorn. (du Cange l. c.)

and as a mark of dignity. Doctors of the University, Canons of Cathedral churches, chaplains of the royal household, are entitled to wear the Birettum, and even obliged to do so.[1] Before it became the general custom in Italy to wear the Birettum, it had also been part of the insignia of the ducal title, and the Roman Pontiff was in the habit of investing the Prefect of the city of Rome with the same mark of distinction, as the ancient Ceremonial still witnesses:

"Imponit Pontifex ei (praefecto) genuflexo infulam sive Birretum Praefecturae dicens: Accipe insigne praefecturae praeeminentiae, quod per nos capiti tuo imponimus."

Later on the *Camelaucium* took the place of the Birettum for the Popes, although they continued to send the latter as a mark of distinction to those whom they wished to honor. Hence, no doubt, originates the phrase "to receive the beretta," when a prince of the Church, a Cardinal is created. Henry VIII, "received the beretta" from Julius II in token of appreciation for what was presumed to be the King's defence of the Catholic faith against the doctrinal changes advocated by Luther, at a time when it could still be said of the monarch that

> Old England's sign, St. George's cross
> His *Barret*-cap did grace.

The flocca or tassel was an outgrowth of the desire for suitable ornament in place of the feathers and circlets which lay dignitaries began to wear. We find mention of the *Birretum Floccatum* in the Statuta Universitatis Aquens. of the year 1489. There it is considered the peculiar privilege of Doctors. Next we find it obligatory to be worn during the canonical offices.[2]

The necessity of repeatedly taking the birettum off at the divine offices naturally suggested its present shape with corners, and to make it of stiffer material than formerly, when

1 "Birretum fuit etiam Doctorum. Nicolaus de Clemengis, lib. de studio Theologico: *Non cappa quippe doctorum facit, non Biretti magistralis impositio, non cathedra sublimior*, aut locus superior," du Cange, Gloss. 1 c.

2. "Ordinavit . . . . quod Canonici cum biretis in capitibus vadant ad divina." Michas Madius ap. Du-Cange l. c.

it was worn continually like a large skull-cap. Marci says :[1] "Ex figuris sepulchralibus colligitur etiam birretum clericale illius Camelaucii formam antiquitus habuisse; sed processu temporis, solida tela subsuta, illi quatuor anguli in modum crucis aliquantulum sublevati sunt."

The four corners are not only the natural development of the ancient birettum but carry a varied symbolism with them. Thus in its form are presented the cross and also the universality or Catholicity of the Church which the dignity of the cleric, whose mission is to the four corners of the earth, represents.

The custom of having but three corners to the birettum is said to have originated in Italy, through a desire to express thus in an especial manner devotion to the mystery of the Holy Trinity, while the figure of the cross at the same time preserved in the form of the birettum indicates the faith in Christ crucified. Where, as in Italy, the four-cornered birettum has become a distinctive mark of the magisterial office, it cannot be worn in the ecclesiastical functions, as is evident from a decree of the S. R. C., Dec. 7, 1844, which states that this kind of birettum "non est chorale indumentum." This rule cannot be said strictly to apply in the United States, although the common use of the three-cornered birettum in all ecclesiastical functions would allow of an argument of analogy against the use of the older form of birettum with four corners.[2]

The color of the birettum worn by the ordinary clergy and bishops was formerly, as a rule, black. The privilege of the purple birettum has been recently granted to patriarchs, archbishops and bishops. Prelates who are not bishops are forbidden to wear the purple birettum.[3]

In Spain the bishops wear the black birettum with a green

1 Hierolexicon verb, *Camelaucium*,

2 Soli Itali, uno angulo submisso, tres ad honorem SSae Trinitatis elevant et nihilominus figura crucis retinetur. *Macri l. c. Ephem. Liturg.* i, 581.

3 This is evident from the Brief of Leo XIII who, speaking of the privilege of the purple birettum, says : "Volumus ut alius, qui episcopali dignitate non sit insignitus ejusmodi ornamento nullatenus potiri queat." (Litt. Apost. 3 Feb. 1888.)

tuft or tassel. Cardinals wear a red birettum. The color of the lining is not prescribed. The usual material is silk.

The rubrics ordain the use of the birettum in ecclesiastical functions except when the Most Bl. Sacrament is exposed for public adoration. Thus the *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae* states: "Cum pervenerit ad altare, stans ante infimum gradum caput detegit, birettum ministro porrigit etc. (Tit. ii, 2.) It is used in all public offices of the Church as part of the ecclesiastical dress.

P. ARMINIO.

RAMBLES IN PASTORAL FIELDS.

I.—LANDMARKS.

FOREIGN local seminaries for philosophy and theology, of national reputation and on the continent, teach the science and art of the ministry from technical books. The North American Colleges in Rome, Louvain and Münster, for the training of priests destined for the United States, follow mostly oral instruction, as probably do the majority of American theological seminaries, in the inculcation of pastoral theology.

Those among our missionary clergy who seek works on the subject must, as a rule, content themselves with the volumes of our Plenary and Provincial Councils on the one side, and on the other, with the pamphlets of approved and not obsolete Diocesan Synods promulgated *ad hoc*.

At the suggestion of the editor of the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW to furnish for its pages some notes of a practical nature on pastoral theology, the writer proposes to offer some literary recollections of the American College and the University of Louvain, the theological Alma Mater of above four hundred priests of the past forty-five years, quite three hundred of whom still survive on the missions of the States. Under the regime of Mgr. John De Neve, to whom practically must be ascribed the establishment on a firm foot-

ing of the College of the Immaculate Conception, Louvain, an elementary course of Introduction to Sacred Scripture and applied Moral Theology was given by Ordinary and Extraordinary Professors of the University proper. This alliance continued until a misfortunate change of program was set up by the old Rector's temporary and ill-advised successors, Rev. Fr. Pulsers and Mgr. Dumont, quondam Bishop of Tournay.

The writer feels confident he is not betraying state secrets by relating a *bon mot* of a Mgr. O'Connell regarding the exact purpose of the Roman North American College. Conversing familiarly, the Monseigneur gave it as his conviction, that the main object of the Collegio Americano was "to polish up officials for the Bishops of the United States." "In that case," I answered, "our respective colleges are not likely to clash, as Mgr. De Neve never concealed the fact that the purpose of the Louvain institution had always been to train up recruits from all parts of Europe, and students sent over by the American Ordinaries, to become *missionaries*, in the strict sense of the word."

To return—the professors selected from the University corps to aid not only the American, but also the Dominican and Foreign Mission Colleges, as well as the affiliated Collège du Saint Esprit, were evidently the more eminently *practici* of the world-famous ecclesiastical staff.

The academic body of seventy professors, in 1867 and thereabouts, comprised probably a score of Rev. Doctors of philosophy, theology, hermeneutics, Biblical languages and "profound course" teachers. But not all these latter had the leisure or inclination to attach themselves to the large parishes of the University town, in the capacity of regular confessors and occasional preachers. Those who conducted so learnedly and so practically the full Moral Course of three or four years' theology, up to the Baccalaureate Degree, did have the custom of occupying confessionals regularly in their respective resident quarters; and not infrequently we were electrified by hearing that Professor so and so had delivered himself of a famous oration, at St. Peter's, St.

Michael's, or at our own quaint parish church of St. Quentin's.

At the successive and imposing Corpus Christi public processions, carried out in imitation of mediæval magnificence, each of these dear and edifying authors and doctors failed not to take his place humbly in the line of the homage-bringers to the august sacramental Lord, deigning to appear among His faithful. This conduct of the Doctors Reusens, Lamy, Haine, Moulart, and a Professor Vandensteen, lecturer on Gury's four first *Tractati*, is signalized to show that the applied science of moral teachings, observance of other than sacrificial rubrics, the art of instruction, of direction in the spiritual life *in foro interno*, and principally, indeed, the experienced tact in dealing with superiors and subjects, which is, perhaps, the marrow of pastoral theology, received their full share of attention. Such were the familiar and almost weekly exercises of these parochially-attached assistants, exalted in mind and large in heart.

In lecturing to the sixty or seventy-five alumni of the Mission Colleges, theology was taken out of the book form, though tied to a certain author as a guide, and presented in popular Latin and home-spun guise, something to fare into the wide world withal, to guide in the government of souls, in the relations with Bishops, fellow-priests, and for every Sunday and week-day wear. And not for countries governed under all the stately and orderly machinery of Canon Law was it the lecturer's endeavor to drive his subject home; but distinctly were his interpretations moulded to fit the gigantic and more democratic, if cumbersome, proportions of missions, beyond seas, under arbitrary powers, among clergy and sparse or populous congregations often widely sundered and not *labii unius*.

Prof. Moulart, perhaps the most brilliant genius and accomplished Latin and French linguist among the middle-aged professors, astonished and partially paralyzed a number of first-year recruits in 1868, by introducing his course *De Decalogo* and *De Praeceptis Ecclesiae*, in a perfervid and intensely rapid burst of Ciceronian eloquence, pronounced

with distinctly French accent (always pounding the last syllables) upon the subject of the co-relation of philosophic and theological studies! He shot into the rostrum, spoke his piece and shot out again before the togaed listeners could collect their wits sufficiently to measure the man, or recover from the flash of his classic pyrotechnics. But *then* the lecturer was nervous as well as the lectured; and in a lesson or two, he became more intelligible, slowed down to the plane of the other professors, and, in the end, gave his delighted class the most satisfying elucidation of his section of *Gury cum Ballerini*. Seemingly the most exacting of intellectual efforts on the learner's part, because he flattered them with the supposition that they were "smart" like himself, or could by sharp training be made so, Prof. Moulart was the least dreadful of examiners in the little cuddy holes of rooms, through which matriculates had to pass in rotation for their semi-yearly "running of the gauntlet" at the brown old University. To have him vis-a-vis with one across a table and be quizzed by him in his manly, melodious voice, while his calm, luminous eyes rested not unkindly on yours, was an intellectual treat rather than a painful ordeal—always supposing that one was "well up" in his Tract and kept his nerves strung.

He paired with Reusens, the famous archæologist and pangnostic in the Treatises *de Statibus Particularibus* and *de Censuris*. Here was matter for special treatment in favor of students for America. The pastoral features were made prominent, and our "best theologian," as Francis Patrick Kenrick has been designated, was quoted here as elsewhere, frequently and with applause. American scholars in Europe may thank our Bardstown, Philadelphia and Baltimore doctor and author of Theologies, Polemics and Sacred Writ, for much of the attention they receive and the high esteem in which our country is held. It was, indeed, Card. Sterckx, who died but the very year of 1867, that, having assisted the elder Bishop Spalding and Bishop Lefevre in the establishment of the American College, introduced Kenrick to European fame. Prof. Reusens, however, was too much of a

polyglot and too hesitating and uneasy a speaker and posturer to compare even tolerably with his mate. It was painful to see the evidently full mind labor like a contortionist in its utterance, and sputter about whilst he writhed and seemingly forced the awkward sentences out of his whole diaphraghm. If you could put the spectacle out of your mind and concentrate the intellect coldly on the mental product of the physical effort, it was well worth the trouble; for zealous was he and earnest as Lord Bacon, nearly as much of a *practicus* as Prof. Haine and a rather ugly, yet thoroughly amiable man.

The last mentioned was familiarly and lovingly nicknamed "Mother" Haine, because of his fulfilling in regard to his class the touching similitude of Scripture...."*How often would I have gathered together my children as the hen doth gather her chickens under her wing.*"....(Math. xxiii, 37.) He dwelt in a mansion, side by side with the Collegiate residence of the home professors, on the crooked, cobblepaved Rue de Namur, and was a more particular friend of the College, its president, teachers and students, than any other dignitary of the University. He was a frequent visitor, and sometimes dined at the parlors. Making himself interestedly intimate with their object and purposes, the genial doctor —and former pastor, if we mistake not—was a distinctly avowed patron of American students. He follows to this day their successes and struggles with a brother's and a father's heart, inquiring after them individually, and he delights to hear from his *anciens élèves* on the missions. Mons. le Professeur received testimonials of their high regard, on occasions like that of the consecration of one of Louvain's sons as an American Bishop, when the young prelate and the gathered confrères sent him a combined letter of thanks and congratulations on the recent publication of his sterling and bravely popular *Theologiae moralis Elementa.* Author of half-a-dozen or more volumes in French and Latin, he put his whole learning and all his heart into his *Principia Theologiae Sacramentalis.* His unvarying section of the Elementary Course, with the single exception of *De Matrimonio* was *De Sacramentis.*

And what priest ever taught, who was more fatherly, more limpidly clear, and unbosomed his treasures of wit, commonplace latinity, and comprehensive grasp of the missionary needs with less reserve than this eminently pastoral theologian? Perhaps he knew little—what pastor under the Governments of France, Italy, Belgium, which pay for churches and ministers from the interest of spoliated funds, knows more?—of the special adjustments of the Canon Law (covering the relations of one legally recognized Pastor, the Bishop of an American diocese then, and his only assistant priests) on the matter of handling church fabric and salary accounts. But outside this, it is difficult to find an exception to the universality of the application of the *Elementa* to pastoral functions, duties, powers and proprieties, *proprio nomine*. If he used Gury and his *Casus Conscientiae*, Ballerini, Kenrick, rigorist Dens, lax Diana, or "noster Verstraeten," it was determinedly to draw illustrations for use of countries directly under the Propaganda.

But not to let these scattered leaves lure us too far afield in tempting paths of reminiscence, the knowing reader will bear with a paragraphic reference to sources of pastoral theology within the College doors. A full Dogmatic course, minus a Tract or two, like *De Gratia*, was earnestly and thoroughly given by Father, afterwards Bishop Dumont. Neither must strangers to other than his episcopal episode which ended with the only deposition of a Bishop since the French Revolution, imagine that as a professor he was more aberratic than was consistent with a fighter against Professor Ubaghs, and an opponent of Mgr. Laforêt's *Les Dogmes Catholiques*.[1] For an untitled doctor of theology, he was the hardest of students, the most careful of exposers, and the most papal of ultramontanes. He boldly taught papal infallibility *sine ambagibus*, while the Council of the Vatican was sitting in '69-'70. Himself had been an active missionary for a number of years in the diocese of Detroit, and appreciated the dogmatico-pastoral needs of our clergy. He spoke English

1 A late Louvain letter gives the happy news that "Bishop Dumont departed this life in excellent dispositions."

correctly, with but slight accent, and had long served among his native Flemish, the French and English-speaking congregations of southern Michigan. A story is told of his grim determination, when he set his head to do a thing. It seems that through some unexplained altercation with certain parishioners, these had become so outrageous in their resentment that they actually burned down a church built by him. Mgr. Dumont, at his own expense, immediately replaced it with an *iron* building throughout; and pointing to it he told them: "Now burn that down, if you can!"

Father Pulsers gave *De Matrimonio*, specially written out in files, for our United States; *De Contractibus*, *Jure et Justitia*, and an adapted course of Canon Law from Soglia and Vecchiotti. He, too, had served as a priest with Mgr. De Neve in Michigan, and understood English about as well as he did any tongue, except his native Dutch. Of Mgr. de Neve his students and twenty scores of priests, three Archbishops and seven or eight Bishops, are accustomed now to speak with bated breath and moistened eyes. He had served his hard and long apprenticeship for nine years at and about the missions of Niles, Michigan, adjacent to the old mission of Father Stephen Badden and a short distance from Notre Dame, Indiana.

Twice, in thirty years of manhood and hale age, he had taken up his position as rector; twice he was obliged by an unaccountable malady to lay down the office, as he has now laid it down definitely, and has been succeeded since 1891 by Very Rev. J. Willemsen, S. T. L. professor for the last twenty-two years. Thoroughly alive to, and scrupulous of his full duty alone, he presided over the American College, seeing to every department in person. The only class he taught was the "last year's" course in pastoral theology.

The succeeding articles may be referred to as a slender proof of his insight and skill, because his hand, more than that of any other man or authority, will be visible in whatever may be permitted to follow this biographical sketch of sources in form of a dialogue. Lest, however, we may be

allured into disorder, the syllabus of the papers in contemplation is here appended :

I.—Church Fabric and External Administration.

II.—Internal Administration—Walk and Talk of the Pastor.

III.—Pointers in the Ministry of the Channels of Grace.

IV.—The Priest's Relations with the Church and Society.

THOS. JEFFERSON JENKINS.

CONFERENCES.

THE BANNS OF MIXED MARRIAGES AND THE CELEBRATION OF THE RITE IN CHURCH.

We publish in this number a paper by a member of our hierarchy (whose name is withheld in order to allow greater freedom of discussion on a subject regarding which there exist, no doubt, decided opinions) in which the writer advocates the proclamation of Banns in the case of Mixed Marriages and their celebration in the church.

As regards the Banns we have the letter of Cardinal Fransoni addressed to the Archbishop of Baltimore (July 3, 1847) in which the S. Congregation advises the proclamation of the Banns in the case of Mixed Marriages (Cf. Collect. Lacens. Vol. iii, p. 106).

The same letter adds, however, the clause "quae tamen matrimonia nullo adhibito religioso ritu celebrari oportet." These words, it is true, do not necessarily mean that the contract of a Mixed Marriage to which a priest may lend his *assistentia passiva* must not be celebrated within a church, but they offer a strong presumption against the supposition that such a practice ever obtained under the sanction of the Holy See in this country.

Does the S. Congregation actually permit the practice of a priest not only assisting at a Mixed Marriage performed in the church, but even pronouncing the blessing when the non-Catholic has pledged him or herself to permit the free exercise of the religious duties to the Catholic and to have the children educated in the Catholic faith?

Yes; for example Breslau, a diocese which includes a large mixed population, the rite in the case of marriages between Catholics and baptized non-Catholics is regularly performed in the church, with the blessing of the Ritual—never, however, with the nuptial Mass. The origin of this concession must be traced to the position of Catholics in Germany at

the time when Pope Pius VIII ascended the pontifical chair. It was evidently granted to avoid greater evils which threatened Catholics under an adverse civil ministry enjoying absolute power. Being a matter of pure ecclesiastical discipline the Holy See permitted that the clergy might pronounce a blessing upon a marriage which, *after due dispensation had been obtained at her tribunal, became valid and so far had her sanction.* That she gave this sanction with reluctance was plain from her general legislation, which has its motive in the danger to which the faith of the Catholic party and that of the offspring is exposed, as well as in the loss of domestic peace and happiness of the persons married which commonly follows these unions.

The above-mentioned Brief of Pius VIII to the Prussian Episcopate (March 25, 1830) does not, to our mind, contain any *explicit* sanction of the practice which obtained upon it as a pretence and under the interpretation of the then Minister of State in Prussia, Chev. Bunsen. But the Bishops acted upon it with the full knowledge of the Holy See. The government insisted on the same privileges being allowed to parties who did not fulfill the usual conditions required by the Church for the licit contracting of a Mixed Marriage, in consequence of which the Archbishop of Cologne was imprisoned for instructing the clergy not to participate, under any consideration, in such marriages unless the Canons of the Church were duly recognized in regard to the free exercise of religious worship and the education of the children in the Catholic faith.

Gregory XVI in a letter addressed to the Archbishop of Freising (May 23, 1846) tolerates the "*Mos benedicendi matrimoniis mixtis initis cum Ecclesiae venia*" (exclusa tamen semper Missae celebratione. Cf. Laemmer, Kirchenrecht. 2 edit. II, c. 136).

How far similar reasons "ad praecavenda mala majora et detrimentum ecclesiae" obtain in this country, is made clear by the article in the present number. We believe, however, that some positive approval will be required on the part of the Holy See in order to permit a practice which is not without

its dangers as liable to misuse, even though it may conciliate and serve to edification in other respects.

Whilst we invite an expression of opinion by competent ecclesiastical judges on this topic we deprecate in advance any insistence upon narrow lines of individual views. It is simply a question of principle and its application to actual circumstances. The principle does not merely consist in maintaining our ordinary statutes, but in *so maintaining them that they may serve their original purpose of facilitating the salvation of men by leading them into the Catholic Church.* How this may be done depends largely on the character of the places and persons for whose benefit the statutes, as well as the limitations of their observance, have been made by the divinely inspired wisdom of the Church herself.

THE EDITOR.

THE NEW OFFICES.

We call attention to the fact that the new Offices of St. John Damascene (27 Mart.), and St. John Capistran (28 Mart.) have become obligatory for the universal Church. The former is transferred this year to April 10th; the latter, occurring in Holy Week, receives only a commemoration in the Office and Mass.

HISTORY AND CATHOLICITY.

Qu. Several Catholic youths of my congregation who are attending State schools, with a view of preparing for positions, complained to me that the teacher of History—in dwelling upon the fact that English Protestants persecuted each other because of their religious differences, remarked that such had been the case with all religious denominations. This statement was made apparently with a view of intimating that Catholics were no exception to this rule. The pupils, knowing that the implied accusation had no foundation in regard to the Catholic Church, were nevertheless unable to refute it. Would you kindly give a brief refutation of the above accusation?

Resp. In order to do justice to the cause of Catholic truth which our Reverend Correspondent and the young people in

question have at heart, we discriminate between historical facts, Catholic truth and the discreet teaching of either or both.

1. It is true that Catholics as well as Protestants have at times persecuted one another because of their religious differences. History and daily experience, on a small scale, bears out this assertion, although it has in many instances been exaggerated by writers who were biased against the Church.

2. But such persecutions are *contrary to the spirit and teaching of the Catholic Church and have invariably been discountenanced by her supreme authority.* Neither the Catholic Church nor even Almighty God can, under the law of free will, prevent individuals possessing power and influence and bearing the name of Catholics, from abusing their opportunities to satisfy personal ambition or animosity.

3. Hence it becomes plain that in our instructions of the young we must carefully distinguish between the high standard of moral conduct taught by the Church, and the weaknesses and faults of those who have at times represented or pretended to represent that standard. It may be said that the fruit indicates the quality of the tree ; this is true if the pretended fruit were actually the fruit of the tree under which it may be found. Catholics who strictly live according to the teaching of the Church are of the best moral fibre. But it occurs in every grade in life that men fail to keep the Catholic rule of conduct whilst they keep the Catholic name. The Jews who danced about the "golden calf" were the chosen people of God and the disciples of Moses. Did their idolatry prove the worthlessness or deficiency of the Mosaic guidance and moral which had the direct sanction of Jehovah? No. Yet a stranger looking at the degraded multitude would naturally have said to himself: This cannot be the people of God, the seed of Abraham, bearing the promise of the Messiah.

This view of Catholic truth in relation to historical fact, whilst not to be emphasized in such a manner as to warp the young mind with false impressions of human depravity, should not be lost sight of in pedagogy.

As to the positive falsifications of history which proceed from mere hostility or ignorant bias against the Catholic Church, they are corrected by the reading of Histories written by conscientious and learned Catholics or in some cases even by candid Protestants. These works are numerous enough in English to find their way into the homes of Catholics. A useful little work dealing with such questions in particular is Dr. Parson's "Historical Lies" published not long ago from the *Ave Maria* office, Notre Dame, Ind.

Catholics have nothing whatever to fear for the integrity of their Church and the beneficial influence of its doctrines upon the intellect, the morals and manners of her children; but it is dangerous in the extreme to allow the confusion of her peerless teaching and the practice of those who unworthily represent her, to take hold upon the mind. "The King can do no wrong" was a good maxim when it was used to defend simply the authority of the King, but it created revolution and anarchy when it was abused to cover the palpable crimes of the King.

As we intimated above, it would be folly to emphasize the wrongdoings of men in teaching the young, because they cannot discriminate in the impression made on them between doctrine and example in the same category, but it is equally unwise to insist that because God is impeccable, His instruments are equally so.

A DOUBTFUL MARRIAGE.

Qu. Requested to marry John (a Catholic) to Bertha (a non-Catholic) I obtained a dispensation *ab impedimento mixtæ religionis.* On the day of the marriage just before the ceremony I asked Bertha whether she had ever been baptized. She replied: No. This I had not foreseen; and so told the young man that before they could be married I should have to obtain a new dispensation (meaning that *ab impedimento disparitatis cultus*). He looked at her and said: Weren't you baptized? and from his manner clearly expected her to answer in the affirmative. She then said she was baptized but not in the Catholic Church.

From the circumstances, however, I was strongly of the opinion that she had never been baptized ; and that she answered thus in order to have no further delay in the marriage ceremony. She told me that she belonged to no church, but on her word that she was baptized, and as I was just about to leave that parish, I married them.

Did I act properly ? If not, what should I do in the case ?

Resp. As long as Bertha insisted that she was baptized, and in view of the serious inconvenience (possibly scandal) which ordinarily arises out of an unexpected delay on occasion of a marriage-celebration, the only thing to do was to let the ceremony of mutual consent, before the priest as witness, go on. But as there was a reasonable fear that the marriage was actually invalid, it would have been prudent and proper to call the groom, as soon as convenient after the ceremony, and express to him the possibility of an invalid marriage *in case his betrothed had told an untruth*, assuring him that it was not necessary to tell her of this fact, and letting him know that the matter could be righted by the renewal of mutual consent without any publicity as soon as a dispensation had been obtained. In the meantime the priest, if he found that Bertha had actually told an untruth, should have applied for a *sanatio in radice* since it is not likely that both parties had been conscious of the absolute invalidity of their contract at the time of its performance.

Possibly this can be done still, although it will require great prudence so as not to shock the sensibilities of two persons, who, hardly through their own fault, were kept in ignorance of requirements, non-compliance with which has rendered their marriage invalid, etc.

It may be that the dispensation in the meantime has been obtained by a priest who acted as confessor of John to whom he would be likely to tell of the fact that he influenced his wife to an untruth in order to avoid putting off the marriage and the incident gossip, etc., arising from such delay. Or, Bertha may subsequently have become a Catholic and confessed, thus inducing the removal of the difficulty. These facts would have to be carefully ascertained before taking

direct steps in a matter which is apt to arouse the anxiety or indignation of the parties concerned.

If there is reason to think that John has neglected to confess since the time of his marriage, it would be advisable to consult with the local pastor so that he may watch his opportunity to mend the matter, which is certainly important.

But perhaps Bertha spoke the truth, and this possibility must be kept in mind in practically approaching the parties concerned, for any suspicion in a case like this, especially when it comes from a priest and without apparently sufficient reason, might easily put the matter permanently beyond the reach of a cure.

THE RIGHT OF EXPOSING THE BLESSED SACRAMENT "PRO RE GRAVI."

Qu. Will you kindly inform me and some brother priests through the REVIEW whether it is necessary to have the Ordinary's permission for the XIII or XL Hours' Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament?

If the Ordinary appoints no fixed time for the different congregations in the diocese, is a parish priest at liberty to have the Exposition once or several times a year, as he may think proper?

Resp. The sanction of the Ordinary is required for the above-mentioned devotion or any other of which public exposition is a part. The reason is because these devotions are not accounted among the *Jura mere parochialia* and cannot therefore be presumed, even where there exist canonically erected parishes with their proper rights. (Ex. S. Congr. Episc. et Regal. Decr. 10 Dec. 1703.) To the question: *an sufficiat semel dictam licentiam petere tam pro expositione infra annum quam XL horarum aliisque functionibus, juxta d. ass. institutum, seu potius illa requiratur toties quoties?* the S. Congr. Conc. answered: *Negative quoad primam partem et quoad secundam explicentur functiones.* (S. C. C. die 13 Apr. 1726). The words "toties quoties," show the character of the restriction which is, obviously, to guard the reverence due to the Most Blessed Sacrament, likely to be lessened by too frequent exposition which detracts from the solemnity required by the act.

CAN ABSOLUTION BE REFUSED?

Qu. Can I absolve a parent who persists in sending her child to a school which is practically anti-Catholic, such as the Girard College, in Philadelphia, or to a Quaker-school? I am obliged to act in both the cases mentioned, and would be glad to have your view in the matter.

Resp. A person who persists in sending her child to an *anti-Catholic* school is guilty of grievous sin, and continuing in the same is not thus far properly disposed to receive absolution. This, of course, means that the child is actually educated in such a school, and must needs, under the ordinary laws of nature, imbibe the spirit hostile to the faith which its parent, for one reason or other, professes to hold.

As to the particular school mentioned we would not venture to say that it is anti-Catholic even in spirit. The authorities admit, we believe, no religious profession of any kind within the walls, and the teaching is wholly confined to the secular branches and so-called moral instruction. The children, moreover, may, we understand, receive religious instruction of any kind outside, and are allowed to visit their friends for that or any other proper purpose. This, together with the fact that the children are orphans, and that a parent who is poor has some plea for seeking a comfortable shelter for his or her child, especially with the guarantee that there will be no attempt to proselytize, should exempt such parent from severity in the confessional, even though there is no positive provision made for the child's daily exercise in Catholic piety and faith.

As for the Quaker-schools we should be equally slow to advise harsh measures against a parent who sends his or her child there. The Quakers have as a rule good schools, that is schools which in point of moral discipline and in the inculcation of the gentler qualities excel our common schools. They rarely exercise any sectarian influence upon the child, and simply teach the natural virtues which the parent can most likely direct into positive channels so that the faith of the child need not suffer.

We do not wish to be understood as if intimating that the

moral doctrine of the Quakers could offer a substitute for the Catholic religion. We are speaking of a case where there is question of absolving a parent who believes that the gentle breeding and conservative habits which are characteristic of the "Friends" training, will benefit his or her child, individually, and we find some apology for such parent, provided she does not at the same time neglect to instruct the child in all that will make it a good Catholic in heart, though perchance something of a "Friend" in manner and method. Where the child is obliged to adopt *sectarian practices* the case is different, for this would be a practical denial of the Catholic faith on the part of the parent which would at the same time prove fatal to the young heart and mind.

There will be no need for parents to seek the accomplishments of manners and superior intellectual culture elsewhere when we shall have used our best efforts to incorporate in our own Catholic schools all that is best both without and within. This is done in many parochial schools, but not in all.

Hence let us strive for the efficient building up of the parochial schools; as to the rest, "let us have peace, as far as lies in us, with all men."

FACULTAS BENEDICENDI CORONAS, CRUCES, ETC.

Qu. You would greatly oblige me by answering in the next issue of your REVIEW the following questions, relating to the faculty American priests have: "benedicendi cruces, sacra numismata, et coronas precatorias, eisque applicandi indulgentias iuxta folium typis impressum."

1. Which are these indulgences? Please enumerate them or else give correct and complete title of a work, where I can find authoritative statement of them.

2. What formula is to be employed in blessing them?

3. What exactly is to be understood by "coronas precatorias?"

I have up to this day not been able to ascertain a correct answer to these questions; and you would indeed do a great favor not

to me only, but to many a priest who has his doubts about this important Faculty, by giving a clear and correct answer to the above questions.

Resp. The indulgences attached to the blessings of pious objects, as mentioned the *Facultates Extraordinariæ C. 9*, granted to our missionaries, are enumerated in the Appendix of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (Append. Tit. xvi,) also in Sabetti's *Theologia Moralis* (Append. Cap. ii De Indulgentiis Apostolicis) and in most approved works on Indulgences, such as Maurel, Melata, Prinzivalli, Beringer, etc.

2. The *formula* to be employed is, as a rule the one indicated in the Roman Ritual, as corresponding to the particular objects to be blessed. Where there is no special form the *Benedictio ad omnia* is usually taken.

3. *Coronæ precatoriæ* are the ordinary Rosary beads of five decades for which no indulgence restricted to a particular religious order (but only the *Apostolic* indulgence) is asked. They may be blessed by the simple sign of the cross without any special formnla. Such beads can receive additional indulgences through the blessing with the Dominican, Bridgetine, Crozier or other formulas.

According to an answer of the S. Congregation, the above-mentioned Faculty granted to missionary priests confers the right to bless also the Bridgetine Beads, and includes all blessings to which the Holy See directly has attached those general Indulgences, mentioned under the name of "Apostolic."

STIPENDS AND PAROCHIAL EXPENSES.

Qu. Please answer the following query in the REVIEW: Is it lawful for a pastor to establish a rule in his parish according to which the curate shall receive only the regular Low Mass Stipend for any and all Requiem High Masses celebrated by him; whilst the pastor retains the difference under the plea that it is required for the maintenance of the parochial household?

Resp. The above-mentioned practice cannot be impugned, we believe, on grounds of Canon Law nor is it contrary to

custom. It is true that various decrees of the S. Congregations prohibit under censure the retention by the pastor of Mass stipends when he commits the celebration of them to a curate or other priest. But these decrees have reference only to the *stipendium manuale*, that is the ordinary "intention" for a private Mass. This *stipendium manuale* which goes with the "intention" for which the Mass is offered is distinct from the perquisite which is allowed, according to diocesan or parochial statute, for the solemn functions and which is part of the *jura parochialia*. The celebrations of funeral Masses, of marriages, baptisms and the like are all of this nature and are included in the regular duties of the parish clergy in the same sense as sick-calls, etc., so that independent of the "intention" (fixed by the diocesan law or by usage) for the Mass, the compensation for the additional labor implied in the chanting and carrying out of the ceremonial is supposed to be included in the regular salary, or to be supplied by a certain division of what is called "perquisites," which division depends on the rules approved by the Ordinary for meeting the required expenses of the parish. In this country the Bishops determine, we believe, the division of the perquisites between pastor and assistants according to the circumstances of the place and not according to uniform rule.

This view will appear quite equitable if we remember that the parochial functions claim the attention of the parochial clergy independent of personal considerations, and the income from them, no matter who performs the functions, belongs to the administrator who is supposed to make just compensation out of the income for the work distributed between the attending clergy.

FACULTY OF BLESSING THE SEVEN-DOLOR BEADS.

Qu. A discussion having arisen here as to whether the privilege of blessing the Seven-Dolor Beads is included in our Faculties "Benedicendi coronas," etc., I would ask you to solve the doubt through the REVIEW.

Resp. It does not appear from the text of the Apostolic Faculties granted to the missionary clergy in general that they include the above-mentioned privilege. The Holy See sometimes grants the Faculty directly and a few years ago (Resc. 19 Jan., 1889) Leo XIII declared a *sanatio* with regard to previous doubtful cases, at the same time stating that the faculty was to be granted to seculars as well as religious *through the Superior General of the Servites* (Cf. Rescript. authent. 80. ad x, pag. 652). The Holy See has, however, dispensed of its own accord from the condition of meditating the seven mysteries as essential to the gaining of the Indulgences. The same dispensation applies to the Brigetine Rosary, the privilege of blessing which is included in the Apostolic Faculties.

ANALECTA.

PEREGRINI ADMISSIO AD MISSAE CELEBRATIONEM.

DECRETA.

Quoad admissionem Sacerdotum, praesertim Regularium, peregrinorum ad Missae celebrationem.

"Singuli Episcopi in suis diœcesibus interdicant, ne cui vago et ignoto Sacerdoti Missam celebrare liceat." (Trid. xxii, Decr. de observ. in Missae celebr.,

I.—S. C. U. Inquis. 17 Nov., 1594, declaravit, Regularibus privilegium nullum suffragari, quin prohiberi possint ab Episcopo, ne sacerdotes *saeculares* exteros ad sacrum peragendum in suis Ecclesiis admittant, nisi prius horum literae commendatitiae recognitae et approbatae fuerint per Ordinarium.—Ita ap. Giraldi : de Off. et pot. Parochi. Pars i. cap. 11, n. 53. et Bened. xiv. Inst. 34 § 1.

II.—S. Cong. Conc. ad dub. xiii. "An Religiosi possint admittere ad celebrandum in suis Ecclesiis presbyteros extraneos non habentes licentiam a sua illustrissima Dominatione (*i. e.* ab Archiepiscopo qua Episcopo loci) vel ejus Vicario, si hoc sit prohibitum ab eodem Illustrissimo? Resp. 2 Julii, 1620: Non licere Regularibus in suis ecclesiis ad celebrandum admittere presbyteros *saeculares* contra prohibitionem Illustrissimi Archiepiscopi."—Ita ap. Nouv, Rev. Théol. tom. xi. p. 370.

III.—Episcopus insulae Zacynthi apud S. Congr. de Prop. Fide querelas exposuit de Religiosis presbyteros peregrinos ad celebrationem Missae admittentibus. S. Cong. de Prop. Fide censuit instantiam Episcopi Zacynthi remittendam esse Illmis Patribus Sac. Conc. Trid. Interpretibus, ut ab eis infrascriptum dubium discutiatur et definiatur, videlicet: "*An Ordinarii locorum vigore Concilii Trid. de observandis et vitandis in celebratione Missae, possint, tanquam Sedis Apostolicae delegati, sub pœnis et censuris prohibere ne regulares peregrini in ecclesiis suorum Ordinum in ipsorum Ordinariorum dioecesibus constitutis Missas celebrent sine eorum licentia?*

Et si fortasse hujusmodi dubium negative definiatur, S.C. censebat ob rationes ab Episcopo praedicto allegatas posse eosdem Illmos Patres, cum SSmi beneplacito, eidem Episcopo facultatem faciendi praedictam prohibitionem concedere.

Ad dubia proposita ab Episcopo Zacynthi *S.C.C. respondit die 27 Julii 1626* : Ad 1. Ordinarios locorum ex dispositione S.Concil. Trid. prohibere non posse ne Regulares peregrini in ecclesiis *suorum* Ordinum Missas celebrent absque eorum licentia. Ad. 2. Non esse concedendam Episcopo Zacynthi facultatem faciendi hujusmodi prohibitionem, nisi concurrat frequentia casuum cum negligentia non corrigibilli Superiorum Regularium.

Declaratio haec S. Cong. Conc. relata fuit in Cong. Gen. S.C. de Prop. Fide die 28 Julii, 1626.

"Patres tamen, SSmo D.N. approbante, dixerunt, declarationem praedictam intelligendam esse quoad Regulares peregrinos, qui in ea insula ecclesias suorum Ordinum habent. Caeterum quoad Regulares non habentes ecclesias suarum Religionum *concedendam* (prout concessa fuit) Episcopo praedicto *facultatem* eos prohibendi ne sine sua licentia sacrum ibi celebrent."

Ita *Acta S. Sedis*. Vol. xxiv, p. 705, ex Actis Cong. Generalis de Prop. Fide.

IV.—S. Cong. U. Inq. declaravit suis literis encyclicis sub 20 Febr. 1649 et 26 Ian. 1692, sacerdotes advenas tam regulares quam saeculares admittendos non esse ad celebrationem Missae, nisi literas Episcopi ac Praelati regularis prius ostendant, quibus sacerdotes ita probentur, ut nulla falsitas, umbra vel suspicio relinquatur.

Giraldi et Bened. xiv. ll. cc.

V.—Ad dubium III. "An Superiores regulares Conventuum admittere possint ad celebrationem sanctae Missae in propriis ecclesiis aliquem sacerdotem extraneum absque praevia licentia Superioris ecclesiastici localis? S. Cong. Ep. et Reg. sub die 14. Mart. 1879 censuit respondere: "Detur Decretum S. Inquisitionis."

Decretum, ad quod refertur, hujus tenoris est:

Die 11 Aug 1649 in Congr. S. Off., Emi et Rdmi Cardinales Inquisitores mandarunt intimari Superioribus Religionum, quod mandent suis subditis monasteriorum et conventuum superioribus, ne admittant ad celebrandum in eorum ecclesiis, eorum vel alterius Religionis exteros vagos seu peregrinos, nisi examinatis diligenter litteris obedientiae seu assignationis eorum Superiorum, et testimo-

nialibus promotionis ad sacerdotium; quo vero asacerdotes saeculares, nisi visis litteris testimonialibus subscriptis a Vicario generali seu foraneo Episcopi loci. (Ita ap. Nouv. Rev. Theol. tom. xi. p. 367, 368; et Act. S. Sed. Vol. xi, 602, 603 et Vol. xxiv, pag. 701.)

VI.—*Corollarium.* Ex decretis allegatis quoad Regulares recta cum Konings Comp. Theol. Mor n. 1199, ita summari potest: "Non obstante statuto Episcopi, ne cui vago et ignoto sacerdoti Missam sine ejus licentia celebrari liceat, id tamen Regulares, examinatis litteris eorum Superiorum et promotionis ad sacerdotium in suis ecclesiis concedere poterunt *religiosis*, etiam ignotis, sui vel alterius Instituti, nulla ab Ordinario petita licentia," subintellige: nisi Episcopus vi facultatis Apostolicae prohibitionem fecerit.

CEREUS PASCHALIS.

Ex. Decretis S. R. C. 15 Sept., 1753, in Casalen., 23 Apr., 1875, in Venezuelen., 19 Junii, 1875, in Mexicana permittitur praxis adhibendi ad benedictionem aquae in Sabb. Sancto alium cereum majoris molis, dummodo fuerit alias (scil. in ceremonia ejus deii) benedictus. Eph. lit. ii. 676.

"*E Dioecesi Chicagiensi.*" *De novo cereo paschali in singulis annis.* Estne vere obligatio novi adhibendi cerei paschalis in unoquoque anno, uti aliqui auctores docent, ratione benedictionis?

Resp. Negative. Cl. Quarti docet (De Benediction. Tit. ii. Dub. ii). Cereum paschalem posse iterum atque iterum benedici, si pars praeterito anno absumpta major fuerit, quia tunc ea de causa benedictionem amisit: secus si minor tantum pars absumpta fuerit; quia tunc, ait auctor frustra adhiberetur secunda benedictio, perdurante prima. Eandem sententiam accepit a Quarti. Cl. De Herdt, et docuit Pars V. n. 53. Ratio, quam affert, est, quia benedictiones invocativae possunt quidem repeti, haud vero constitutivae, per quas res efficiuntur sacrae, et, ad has pertinet benedictio cerei paschalis. At cum bona utriusque pace, nos respondemus, nihil obstare, quominus cereus paschalis jam benedictus, iterum et pluries benedicatur. *Primo*, quia benedictio cerei non potest dici simpliciter constitutiva, sed intermedia inter invocativam et constitutivam, ut optime docet *Sacra Liturgia ad usum alumnorum Seminarii Mechlinensis* (Pars altera de Sacramental. Tit. viii. n. 283). Quatenus autem constitutiva hac benedictione benedictus cereus, semper benedictus manet seu cultui divino consecratus. Quatenus vero invocative benedictus, aliquid boni pluries potest super illum a Deo implorari. *Secundo*, stricte loquendo, benedictio cerei paschalis non est vera benedictio, licet ita communiter appelletur (Cfr. Suffr. Gardellinii in Ephem. lit. iv. pag. 473 seq.); hinc haud ita liturgice proprie dicitur, sed ea quo canit Diaconus, praeconium

paschale nuncupatur. *Tertio*, benedictio afficit peculiariter quinque grana thuris, quae cereo infigi debent, per quae ipse Cereus merito dici potest benedictus, et quae in unoquoque anno renovantur. *Quarto*, denique, praxis omnium Ecclesiarum fert, ut cereus idem pluribus annis inserviat, nemine reclamante, et tamen semper benedicitur, si ita loqui fas sit. Ergo nihil vetat, quominus cereus paschalis pluries benedicatur, quin semper in annos renovetur. Ita. Eph. lit. v. pag. 453. vi. J. P.

DISPENSATIONES MATRIMONIALES.

Declarationes S. Officii quoad Decretum ejusdem S. Congreg. super *dispensationibus matrimonialibus in articulo mortis* 20 Febr. 1888 emanatum.[1]

I. *Ad Archiepiscopum Compostellanum.*

Illme et Rme Domine.

Litteris datis non multis abhinc diebus quaerebat Amplitudo Tua, utrum vi decretorum diei 20 Februarii, 1888, et 1 Martii, 1889, valeant Ordinarii per se vel per parochos dispensare super impedimentis publicis juris ecclesiastici, exceptis presbyteratu et affinitate in linea recta, omnes in articulo mortis constitutos, licet matrimonium civile, quod vocant, non celebraverint nec vivant in concubinatu.

Res delata est ad Emos DD. Cardinales una mecum Inquisitores Generales, qui in Congregatione habita feria IV. die 17 currentis mensis respondendum mandarunt: *Negative.*

Quod dum significo, fausto quaeque Ampt. Tuae precor a Domino.

Addictissimus in Domino

R. *Card.* MONACO.

Datum Romae die 22 Septembris 1890.

1 Cf. AM. ECCL. REV. 1891, II. p. 139.

BOOK REVIEW.

HIERURGIA, OR THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE MASS. With notes and dissertations elucidating its doctrines and ceremonies, and numerous illustrations. By Daniel Rock, D.D. Third edition, revised by W. H. James Weale. Two Volumes.—John Hodges, Charing Cross, London. 1892. Benziger Bros.

Among the excellent works comprised in the Catholic Standard Library issued by Mr. John Hodges of London, a unique place is to be assigned to these two volumes, in fine typographical style and with their choice of engraved illustrations. Dr. Rock first published the work in 1833. His original purpose was to afford his Protestant fellow-countrymen a manual which not only contained the prayers, but explained the ceremonies and elucidated the doctrine of the Mass. Under the encouragement which he received in the perfecting of the work at Rome from the Earl of Shrewsbury, the scope and size of the book grew considerably, so that it contains not only an extensive explanation of the ceremonies and the Ritual of the Liturgy, but likewise a number of dissertations on the Eucharist, the invocation of Saints, Purgatory, and Images. It gives a detailed account of the origin and gradual development, to their present form, of the priestly vestments, and discusses points of disciplinary observance in the Western and Oriental Churches.

Much interesting information is collected about the early Church services in the Catacombs and these are illustrated from original drawings made partly on the spot and partly from authentic copies.

Throughout the work bears evidence of much erudition and patient research and the author has undoubtedly been greatly successful in tracing Catholic doctrine through the Catholic liturgy back to the very days of the Apostles and their disciples. The two chapters on the Creed and the Dyptichs are especially interesting as furnishing early evidence of the faith held in the Catholic Church to this day. The appendix exhibiting extracts from the ancient liturgies in proof that the Real Presence must have been taught in all the churches which the Apostles or their immediate disciples founded, is of much value in present polemics with members of the

Anglican communion. The chapter on the Catholic Canon of Scripture is equally to the point, and has been inserted to show reason why the author drew for his arguments justly upon certain portions of Holy Writ accounted among the Apocrypha by non-Catholics.

The labor of the present editor, Mr. James Weale, whose researches in the field of mediæval liturgy and hymnology are known to be of a high order of merit, has been confined to a careful revision of the original edition, verifying the references and quotations and occasionally amplifying the latter.

The book truly ranks as a "standard" work on the subject of the Mass and its form is wholly in keeping with the dignified theme which it discusses.

THE MAKING OF ITALY. By the O'Cleary (of the Middle Temple), Barrister-at-Law.—London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1892.

Those liberal Catholics and well-meaning but ill-informed Protestants who have been asking the question: Why does not the Catholic Church reconcile herself with the new Kingdom of Italy, since the latter is an accomplished fact? will find the completest answer that has yet appeared in our language in this book. It points out with unmistakable authority whence all the demoralization among the people of Italy, which we are so fond of complaining of, arises, and it lays open the secret mechanism employed by the political factions of central and southern Europe to accomplish the downfall of the temporal power of the Pope, partly through hatred of the Church, and even more so for the purpose of furthering their own ambitious projects. The vaunted unity of Italy, such as it is, without the balancing power of a free Papacy, has become a political difficulty, and, we may add, a national curse to the people who were falsely led, or supposed to applaud it for a time. The author, in giving us a complete narrative of the formation of the Italian kingdom, proves himself fully competent to deal with the subject from a wholly impartial point of view. His sources of information, for the most part, are official documents, dispatches and reports from Piedmontese and Italian archives. In relating the affairs of France touching the campaign in Italy in 1859, he has used the official report of the French Staff, supplemented by the accounts of General Hamley. For the Garibaldian campaigns he gives us almost exclusively the narratives of the Garibaldian and Italianist officers. The inner history of the revolution in Sicily and Naples

becomes clear from the copious extracts taken from Admiral Persano's diary and correspondence with Cavour. The parliamentary documents of Turin and Westminster furnish impartial light for the understanding of the conduct of Italian officials in regard to the brigands. For the campaign of Mentana," says Mr. O'Cleary, "I have had at my disposal numerous narratives of both Papal and Garibaldian eye-witnesses, and this, moreover, is a period of which I can claim personal knowledge. In the account of the invasion of the Roman States, 1870, I have closely followed De Beaufort, whose work on the subject, with the mass of official documents it contains, is the best available authority on it."

To the veracity and justice of the writer's account no one, who reads it without settled prejudice, will be inclined to take exception, and yet it is almost incredible to what length the so-called champions of freedom have gone in wronging the people whom they pretended to benefit. But in the light of these facts we are enabled in a large degree to understand those other facts which mark the present results of the Unità. The temporal power of the Papacy in Italy has, for the time being, been destroyed. It was handicapped long before the Piedmontese actually forced their entrance into Rome. The destruction of that power means the limitation of the influence of the Catholic religion upon the Italian people ; and the effects of this limitation are evident in broadest facts. Lawlessness and crime have increased at an enormous rate. Take the official statistics as they were laid before the Parliament at Rome in 1875 to induce it to pass a new law against brigandage :

Years.	*Offences against the person.*	*Offences against property.*
1863-64	29,637	43 586
1865-66	43,610	60,785
1867-68	47,536	90,259
1869-70	55,825	98,526
1871-72	66,000	108,000

This is a sample of the moral aspect which the boasted regime of reform has brought about in Italy. From an economical point of view an equally striking answer comes as a result of the promised industrial and financial prosperity, which the new ministry promised under the administration of La Marmora ; because it was to be expected that the wholesale spoliation of Church property inaugurated by degrees wherever the Italian Government had gained ground, would lessen the burden of taxation imposed upon the

people during the early elections. In one year alone—1867—one hundred and twenty million dollars were levied upon Church-property, which the generosity of generations of faithful Catholics who loved the glory of God's house had made valuable. Withal, every form of taxation that existed under the old Government was preserved, "new taxes were added, till at length the free citizen of United Italy had the satisfaction of knowing that the State drew something from his food, his clothing, his furniture, his windows, his pay or pension—everything in fact, except the air he breathed."—The Papal Government had been acknowledged by the European powers to be the most economical Government on the continent; it had replaced the paper currency of the last revolutionary Government by good gold coin and assumed moreover the debts contracted by that Republic in 1849. The people have since felt and acknowledged the difference.

In 1862, the year when the first budget of the new kingdom of Italy was submitted to Parliament, the national debt was six hundred million dollars of our money; at the beginning of the year 1891, the funded debt alone amounted to no less than two thousand six hundred million. Signor Luzzati, Minister of Finance in his report on the budget of 1888-89, wrote: "While the State debt of Italy ranks fourth in amount, coming after the debts of France, Russia and England, yet when compared with the economical condition of the country it stands the highest."

We have only given a very fragmentary glimpse at the "accomplished facts" the history of which our author relates on the evidence of undoubted authority. He shows, too, how the Italian people as a whole are not responsible for these facts in which they were forced to play a part. The unity of Italy as presented to-day was not brought about by a national movement but by a party who found itself favored by foreign arms. There must and will be a reaction sooner or later which will end in the independence of the Holy See, and that independence, if anything, will assure the welfare and peace of Italy.

SOCIALE FRAGE UND SOCIALE ORDNUNG, Oder Institutionen der Gesellschaftslehre. Von Fr. Alb. Maria Weiss, O. Pr. (Two Volumes). Freiburg im Br.—B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo., 1892.

De Tocqueville, in his *L'ancien régime et la révolution* has admirably illustrated the principle that all radical reforms, no matter how

laudable they be in their aim or in the abstract, are essentially a means of destruction whenever they ignore the dependence of parts in an organism; that is to say, whenever they fail to recognize elements which, whilst not directly the object of reform, are nevertheless connected with it. It is in the regardless tendency toward change, which labors to cut off or root out, that the true danger of the struggle for freedom and amelioration, which offers the motive for every revolutionary movement, must be looked for. Applied to politics this principle accounts for the disastrous failures of the new order of things in some of the States of Europe, and this, quite independently of any want of honesty in the leaders of the various national movements. Where State autonomy has been the rule for centuries there the cry of republican freedom is apt to create suspicion in those who have managed to be loyal; and with those who are discontented it is equally apt to be misunderstood as anarchy which allows full rein to their popular instincts.

When the social or political organism has been thus deranged by imprudent application of force-remedies, nothing else will save the body public from ruin but a reorganization of the entire system on consistent principles of moral hygiene. The principles themselves are to be found in the Christian religion which was indeed intended by God for the regeneration of man and the effects of which from the first proved that its maxims and laws were the constructive canons of civilization and peace on which in turn rests the prosperity of nations and the security of governments.

It is the difficulty of bringing into due recognition the elements of this order which confronts those who seek to aid in the social reform of the day, about the necessity of which there seems to be no question if we may take as an index of it the numerous solutions of the so-called social problem which are offered us on every side by moralists and statesmen. In the United States the good fortune of a gradual growth of republican freedom, in keeping with the resources of the country, has saved us from the violent disruptions which we have seen in France and other continental States. Still there are social problems with us which threaten trouble and which the rapid powers of local organization may bring to a swift climax in the shape of party resistance, the coping with which means destruction to a thrifty commonwealth.

Newspaper education has made public opinion a changeable quantity, yet withal a quantity of gigantic proportions which is to be feared by all classes. The men who have managed to control

the press in the interests successively of different factions have brought about that most serious of all public states of mind—a confusion of principles of right. It may have been the cleverest thing for these leaders to gain their own ends, knowing that when men lose sight of fundamental truth they are quite prepared to hearken to any voice which can make itself heard, or follow any lead that can make itself felt by pressing upon them. Under such circumstances we want not only the principles but their forcible application to existing conditions.

Our author takes up the old, old wisdom, the approved maxims of Christian ethics and uses them as a test for the proposed and actuated reforms in the social order. In doing so he reconstructs. Having pointed out the evils which gnaw at the vitals of public life under the guise of socialism and that even worse enemy, modern liberalism, he analyses the functions of right in the light of its origin. Next he examines one after another the foundations of society, the individual, the family, the State. At every step he dissipates the fallacies which the speculations of doctrinaires and enthusiasts have raised on these foundations, showing their inadequacy and the danger of their falling and raising the dust, if not destroying what is healthy, around them. Finally he brings us to the Church, constructed by supernatural hands and on foundations of eternal wisdom. There the student of social and political economy may see the work of construction perfected, may learn to build in permanent fashion, and find at the same time a guarantee of safety by placing himself under the patronage of the Master-builder from whom all things that are proceed, and Who has ordained all for a common end, and that end man's eternal welfare.

P. Weiss has, in all this, utilized the material which is ever at hand ; his method, too, differs in no important way from that generally pursued by writers on social ethics of our day ; but there are still many original thoughts in his book, and much in the way in which he states things, which will attract the Christian student of philosophy. Nor does he pretend to offer anything novel in the way of solving the social problem. He is earnest in his desire that Catholics and especially the clergy should take hold of the right side of the movement, and counteract by united effort the sad ravages which socialism and, even more so, liberalism are making in their attacks upon the ancient and immutable truth. He has but a scant hope of averting or crushing the destructive power of the enemy and yet he would not omit to do what might save many

from ruin, at a time, when it would almost appear as if "all flesh should perish" by the multiplicity of false doctrines. The work demands attentive study, both by reason of the crisis which impends over modern civilization as a necessary result of our present tendency, and also because its merits are of an order which recommend it to the lovers of right and truth, a well-informed defense of which is more than ever in keeping with our Christians and priestly vocation.

What has impressed us most in the reading of the book is the ruthless manner in which the author stigmatizes that liberalism in religion which, founded on superficial knowledge of facts and reasons, dogmatizes against whatever, having the merit of age, is opposed to its modern notions.

LITERARY, SCIENTIFIC AND POLITICAL VIEWS OF ORESTES A. BROWNSON. Selected from his works by Henry F. Brownson.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1893.

It must be supposed that disjointed selections from an author like Brownson, remarkable for the impetuous vigor with which he carried analysis to the extreme limit of his observations, would fail to give the reader a fair estimate of his power as a thinker. But the resistless longing to uncover truth which prompted this remarkable flow and continuity of thought, and which made him despise the use of words unless for the purpose of explaining principles, was not the only trait of Brownson's remarkable genius. He was a man naturally self-reliant. At the same time the keenness of his intellectual vision and his ingrained honesty taught him that his self-reliance could be permanently sustained only by resting on a basis of absolute truth. For that basis he looked. He spent years in sounding, examining, digging deep. Many times he thought he had found the rock—until he felt his ground again to yield. Finally he came upon a solid foundation, and once he had taken his stand upon that basis he felt there was no more reason to doubt or cause to fear. It is this consciousness of the fixity of his foundation which rings forth from every stroke of his weapon and which the reader cannot but recognize in every fragment of his voluminous writings. Never was the recognition of this principle more needed than in these days and in our own midst. Mr. Henry Brownson, the editor, bears witness to the fact in his manly preface when he says: "The

error of those who aim to be christians in religion and gentiles in literature, education, science and politics, can only be accounted for on the supposition that they regard religion as something additional to nature, but yet separate from it, and not as the leaven that is mixed with the measures of meal 'till it leavens the whole mass. Now, if christianity is to be anything, it must be everything. . . . In the attempt to emancipate science and politics from religion we have lost God and deified ignorance and passion, so that the very existence of order is threatened with ruin. The only hope of safety is in bringing men back to sound christian principles, to the eternal principles of truth which are always and everywhere the same and are a law for all other actions."

It is precisely this which gives value to the judgment of Brownson on all questions connected with our social and political life, that he viewed them not only as a native American and as a loyal member of our Commonwealth, but from the high altitude of the divine purpose from which all social life derives its being and faculty. He did not believe it a prudent policy at any time to ignore facts because they were visible only in the spiritual order and uncomfortable to the sensitive society whose members agree to shut their eyes and accept as non-existent what they do not care to see. Brownson hated shams in any order. He gloried in tearing the mask from those suave enthusiasts who with fine words of disinterested patriotism make for their own ends; and if he seemed to rejoice in chastising with some degree of bitterness the cant of a servile press and pulpit we can excuse it as readily in him as we do similar sallies in the case of St. Jerome, that is to say, on the score of his honesty and love for truth.

There are few questions of a practical nature concerning Church or State, morals or science, which Brownson did not treat exhaustively. We say exhaustively, because as an essayist for many years he often returned to the same subject and viewed it from many different aspects. An extremist, at times, in pressing forward against an error even though it were of little consequence apart from the boastfulness or condescension with which it had been urged by some unsound teacher, it will be found that Brownson was on the whole moderate, when he is judged, not by his manner but in the sum total of his views upon any given question of importance. Even where there seems to be some contradiction in his expressed opinions we shall find on examination that it is merely a difference of emphasis, the manner of insisting for the time on one point to

the apparent and entire exclusion of another. This fact must be remembered in reading Brownson's essays and estimating the value of his views.

He is constantly combatting some enemy ; and whilst principle and method remain ever the same, his quick and energetic motion toward the weak spot of his foe gives the impression of changeable impulse rather than consistent polemics.

This does not imply that he had not also certain peculiar opinions of his own not endorsed by other accredited thinkers of the Catholic Church. Thus he believed that the scholastic method was defective in this that it tended to make the student lose sight of the faith objectively considered as an organic whole. But we can easily understand why a man who had been so long in search of internal unity of faith, could, when he had at length found it, cling thereto with a certain partiality and covet the idea of it especially as an objective organic whole.

In many cases Brownson forecast the difficulties with which the religious, the social and political air is at present densely filled. He solved them too, only there was then no immediate need for applying the solution. Men in the present generation have to some extent lost sight of it, because they cannot or will not agree on the principles and the noisy champions of progress do not admit that the old truth can still serve to combat the hydra of error.

Brownson's exposition of the school question may serve as an example leaving hardly anything to criticise. He believed in the right and expediency of the Public school, though he absolutely denied the right of the State to teach. Let the State insist on education for its citizens and see that each receives such education as is essential for the exercise of good citizenship. But further than this the State may not go. It might establish Public schools and in equity allow the levied taxes to be distributed for the purpose of education so that every citizen may avail himself of such means as are offered if he wish, but it is not just to erect schools for one class of the people, making it practically impossible for others to use them. That our present Public school system, whilst it may suit a large number of citizens who care little about religious influence in education, is unconstitutional in so far as it excludes Catholics who believe that it is impossible to divorce religion from education, Browson shows very conclusively. "We hold" he says, "that education, either of the intellect or of the heart, or of both combined, divorced from faith and religious discipline is dangerous

alike to individual and society. All education should be religious and intended to train the child for a religious end, not for this life only but for eternal life ; for this life is nothing if severed from that which is to come . . . Of course we do not and cannot expect, in a State where Protestants have equal rights with Catholics before the State, to carry our religion into Public schools designed equally for all, we have no right to do it. But Protestants have no more right to carry their religion into them than we have to carry ours ; and carry theirs they do, when ours is excluded." Elsewhere he shows, how, what has been called "our common Christianity" which is to offer the neutral ground of teaching in the Common schools, is distinctly opposed to the Catholic faith. "The difference between Catholics and Protestants is not a difference in details or particulars only, but a difference in principle. Catholicity must be taught as a whole, in its unity and integrity, or it is not taught at all . . . To exclude from the schools all that is distinctive or peculiar in Catholicity is simply to exclude Catholicity itself, and to make the schools either purely Protestant or purely secular and therefore hostile to our religion." But he does not advocate the destruction of the Public school system. He argues for "its modification so far as necessary to protect the conscience of both Catholics and Protestants in its rightful freedom." A fair division of the school fund is after all only the restitution of the taxes levied from Catholics as well as Protestants with the purpose that they might thus facilitate the common distribution of means by which to educate all the children of our Republic for the common advantage.

But we are exceeding our limits in calling attention to this useful selection from Brownson's works, which covers nearly every theme of importance in religious or secular polemics and many interesting topics of a purely ethical character. Some of the selections may not to the desultory reader, be intelligible in their fragmentary form, but one need not read many pages before beginning to feel a sharpening of the intellectual appetite and a genuine satisfaction with the direct reasoning and bold statement of the writer, which helps to a general interpretation of his views. A study of Brownson's volumes is one of the effective ways to obtain that practical culture and that correctness of judgment concerning subjects of popular interest which every priest needs in these times. A mere cursory perusal of the present volume is likely to lead to that study which offers both originality and, apart from philosophical speculations, thorough safety in the exposition of Catholic principles.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE CREED EXPLAINED; or An exposition of Catholic Doctrine according to the Creeds of Faith and the Constitutions and Definitions of the Church. By the Rev. Arthur Divine, Passionist.—New York, Chicago and Cincinnati, 1892: Benziger Bros.

THE CATHOLIC PRIESTHOOD. Vol. I. Part 1.—The great dignity of the priesthood;—vocation to it. Part 2.—The private life of the priest. Vol. II. Part 3.—The public life of the priest Part 4.—The mixed life of the priest. By Rev. Michael Muller, C.SS.R. Benziger Bros.

HIERURGIA, or, The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. With notes and dissertations elucidating its doctrines and ceremonies, and numerous illustrations. By Daniel Rock, D.D. Third edition revised by W. H. James Weale. Two volumes.—John Hodges, London, 1892. Benziger Bros.

HORAE DIURNAE. Breviarii Romani ex decreto SS. Concilii Trid. restituti etc. Editio tertia post Typicam.—Ratisbonae, Neo Eboraci and Cincinnatii. Frid. Pustet. 1893.

MOMENTS BEFORE THE TABERNACLE. By the Rev. Matthew Russel, S. J., author of Emmanuel:—a Book of Eucharistic verses.—Benziger Bros. 1893.

JUBILEE HYMN for the Celebration of the Golden Episc. Jubilee of His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. Poem by Eleanor C. Donnelly. Latin version by Rev. H. T. Henry. Music by B. Hamma. Fisher Bros. New York and Toledo. 1893.

JUBILEE HYMN for the Celebration of the Golden Episc. Jubilee &c., words by Eliza Allen Starr. Music by Cav. Decio Monti.—Fisher Bros. 1893.

LITERARY, SCIENTIFIC AND POLITICAL VIEWS OF ORESTES A. BROWNSON. Selected from his works by Henry F. Brownson.—Benziger Bros. 1893.

MISSION WORK AMONG THE NEGROES AND INDIANS. What is being accomplished by means of the Annual Collection taken up for our missions. Members of the Commission. His Emin. James Card. Gibbons, Archb. of Balt., Most Rev. Dr. Ryan, Archb. of Philad., and Rt. Rev. Dr. Kain, Bp. of Wheeling.—Baltimore. Foley Bros., Printers. 1893.